

March, 1939

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON



19446
■■■■■■■■■■
IARI



CHRISTOPHER SMART IN LONDON: *Roland B. Botting* - - - 3

AN ADDITION TO THE CANON OF STEPHEN CRANE:
Lyndon U. Pratt - - - - - 55

THE FRENCH LABOR MOVEMENT 1880-95: *Harold E. Blinn* - 59

19446
Pullman, Washington

RESEARCH STUDIES
of the
STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

PAUL P KIES, *Professor of English*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CARL M BREWSTER,
Professor of Organic Chemistry

CARL I ERICKSON,
Associate Professor of Psychology

HERMAN J DEUTSCH,
Associate Professor of History

RONALD F MACLENNAN,
Associate Professor of Zoology

Entered as second-class matter December 26, 1936, at the post office at Pullman, Washington, under Act of August 24, 1912

Research Studies of the State College of Washington is published in Pullman, Washington, by the State College of Washington. It is issued four times a year—in March, June, September, and December.

PURPOSE. *Research Studies* is established to provide a medium of publication for articles of research in the pure sciences and arts, it is limited to material making a contribution to knowledge. Its pages are open to the faculty and the advanced students of the State College of Washington.

MANUSCRIPTS. Authors who wish to publish in *Research Studies* should submit their manuscripts to Paul P Kies, Room 305, College Hall, Pullman, Washington. Though no strict limit is set as to the maximum number of pages or the nature or number of illustrations, authors are reminded that the papers must be actual research. Long introductions, unnecessary comments, and repetitions are not acceptable. Authors who will assume the expense may arrange for the inclusion of extra pages, tables, or illustrations.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. *Research Studies* will be mailed postpaid to subscribers for two dollars a year. Subscriptions are payable in advance to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A.

EXCHANGE. *Research Studies* is offered in exchange to other colleges, universities, learned societies, and libraries. Publications sent in return should be addressed to the Exchange Department, Library, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A. At present all back numbers and title pages can still be supplied.

SINGLE NUMBERS. Single numbers will be sold or exchanged as long as available, orders should be addressed to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A. For prices of back numbers (with the list of articles in each number), see the page following the "Contents" page of Vol VI and pp 103-04 of the same volume. The price of the present number is seventy-five cents.

RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Volume VII

March, 1939

Number 1

CHRISTOPHER SMART IN LONDON

ROLAND B. BOTTING

Associate Professor of English

Grub Street of the mid-eighteenth century, madhouses, and the debtors' prisons were not normally the soil from which sprang poems filled with spiritual ardor. Yet, late in life, Christopher Smart—hand-to-mouth writer who could never match his expenditures with his income, was usually carried home from the alehouse, and knew well the inside of at least one insane asylum—did achieve *A Song to David*; and ever since, those who have sensed the genius of the piece have wondered. Even now, a reader who comes to the *Song* fresh from *The Hop Garden* or the *Midwife* or the *Hymn to the Supreme Being*, with its prefatory puff of Dr. James and his fever powder, must still feel that something almost miraculous came to pass during the author's confinement. Probably it will always be so.

Recently, however, a growing and profitable interest has been shown in this riddle¹, and Mr. W. Force Stead's promised edition of the manuscript written by Smart during his confinement² cannot but help us to a fuller understanding of how the man who chronicled the opinions and activities of Mary Midnight and Ebenezer Pentweazle came to be the author of the *Song to David*. Meanwhile, other work remains to be done. If we are to understand the nature of the change which came over Smart, we need to know better the man upon whom it was wrought, for the existing accounts of his life are either so inaccurate or so lacking in specific detail as often to conceal rather than reveal him. The most widely known, Thomas Seccombe's in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, is very unsatisfactory in it, for example, the state-

¹L. Binyon, "The Case of Christopher Smart," *English Association Pamphlet*, No. 90, Oxford, 1934; John Middleton Murry, "The Madness of Christopher Smart," *Discoveries*, London, 1930; *A Song to David and Other Poems*, ed. Percival Serle, Melbourne, 1923; Cyril Falls, "Christopher Smart," *The Critic's Armoury*, London, 1924.

²"A Christopher Smart Manuscript," *TLS*, XXXVII (1938), 152. Since this paper was written, *Rejoice in the Lamb* (London, 1939) has appeared, for the student interested in Smart's personality, it supplies a wealth of new material, and the editor has likewise thrown light into several of the darkest places of the author's biography.

ment is flatly made that Smart was confined in Bedlam in 1751; doubt is expressed that he had anything to do with *Mother Midnight's Miscellany*, and yet the *Nonpareil* and *Mrs. Midnight's Orations* are described as "merely selections from the original 'Miscellany'"; and no mention whatever is made of his verse translation of Horace or his connection with the *Old Woman's Oratory*. Nor is the life by Christopher Hunter,³ prefixed to the 1791 edition of Smart's poems, more satisfactory. The same delicacy of taste that led the editor to exclude the *Song* from that collection apparently caused Hunter to allude in vaguest generalities, if at all, to some of Smart's most revealing characteristics and activities. Dates seldom concern this biographer; and Smart's associates, the circumstances under which he knew them, his mode of life are all given too little attention. As will appear to a reader of their biographical sketches, Alexander Chalmers and Robert Anderson preserved many of Hunter's faults and added less material of their own than is desirable. And though Mr. K. A. McKenzie's *Christopher Smart: sa vie et ses oeuvres*⁴ is the most detailed account at present available, it has certain obvious shortcomings: for example, Smart's removal to London is dated in 1752, and the *Old Woman's Oratory* is not mentioned. Thus the present attempt at a more circumstantial account of Smart's career in London may be justified, even though the story can be but partially and may perhaps at times be inaccurately told. Now and then, one feels that Smart lived chiefly for the exasperation of any future biographer; and the more one learns of the man, the more one is impressed with the variety and intricacy of the enterprises in which he was engaged, as well as by the pseudonyms and mystifications with which he concealed them. But perhaps the story is here told sufficiently well to place him in a clearer light than that in which he has previously stood and also, incidentally, to show something more of the circumstances under which literary men waged their war for livelihood in the London of the third quarter of the century.

When Smart left Cambridge to reside permanently in London was until recently distinctly debatable. The account in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is indefinite, leaving the implication that it was between November, 1753, and 1755; and earlier biographers—Chalmers

³ Edmund Gosse, "Christopher Smart," *Cambridge Review* (1887), 366.

⁴ Paris, 1925

and Hunter, for example—specify 1753. It is now, however, apparent that the change must have come earlier, and the most recent editors of Gray's letters prefer 1749.⁵ All things considered, some time in that year, following March 9, seems most probable.⁶ It is clear, however, that he had previously established connections of a sort in the city. By 1744 he had already contracted a debt of £50 with a London tailor.⁷ During the visits that bore that fruit, he must have made acquaintances there, but little is known of who they were or what the circumstances of Smart's association with them.

Nor is the nature of his first literary connection with the metropolis more certain. The first edition of his translation of Pope's "Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day" (1743) was printed by the University printer, J. Bentham, and appears to have been strictly a Cambridge publication; the second edition (1746) was also printed by Bentham, but sold by R. Dodsley. The year 1748 found him writing Dodsley concerning his projected collection of odes⁸ and also contributing to the *London Magazine*. In the January issue of this periodical is a musical setting of his ode "Idleness," and later in the year the three parts of *The Rural Day* are printed.⁹ That these contributions were

⁵ *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley (Oxford, 1935), I, 274. Most of what we know of Smart's life at Cambridge and the sources of our knowledge are summarized in this edition. See also C. D. Abbott, "Christopher Smart's Madness," *PMLA* XLV (1930), 1015.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 315. "On or about the year one thousand seven hundred and forty eight, a person [Mrs. Midnight] who had been a great traveller came to London, fraught with learning and experience, and frequented the coffeehouses and other places about town, where the sage and polite resort, dressed in a high crown-hat, and otherwise accounted like a piece of venerable antiquity." *Nonpareil*, p. iii. *The Nonpareil* was published during Smart's confinement, it is therefore possible that the preface was not from his pen. Even if it was, his condition at the time was not one from which minute accuracy was to be expected.

On February 9, 1747-48 he wrote thus from Pembroke Hall to someone, evidently a London bookseller: "I sent to you about a month ago for some books, & should be glad to know whether you have forgot, or not received the letter. My service to Mason when you see him, & tell him if he stays much longer in Town, I shall expect to hear from him." One wonders whether the bookseller's delay in any way reflects the state of Smart's credit. (The original of the letter is in the R. B. Adam Collection at the University of Rochester.) On March 9 Gray mentions (*op. cit.*, I, 315) Smart's part in a bit of college politics, but in December "on l'a déplacé des appartements qu'il avoit occupés depuis son élection comme 'fellow'" (McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 20.) See also *Rejoice in the Lamb*, pp. 22, 24.

⁷ Gray, *op. cit.*, I, 291.

⁸ Edmund Gosse, "Christopher Smart," *TLS*, XXV (1926), 355. McKenzie (*op. cit.*, p. 60) summarizes the evidence against Smart's authorship of *The Student's Companion* (1748).

⁹ XVII (1748), 34 f and 564 f. I have been unable to make a complete examination of this periodical for Smart material; others of his works may well have appeared in its pages.

voluntary may be open to doubt, for when the first part of *The Rural Day*, "A Morning-Piece," was reprinted in the *Student* for July, 1750, it was accompanied by the complaint that

a very imperfect copy of this was inserted in the London Magazine, without the knowledge or consent of the author, for which the proprietors of that exquisite Miscellany may one day receive his thanks.

Yet remembering Gray's allusions to Smart's "vanity and faculty of lying," one cannot but wonder that more than one of his pieces should *accidentally* have found their way into the hands of the editor in the same year. In addition, it is almost incomprehensible that what Smart refers to as imperfections in the earlier version are the fault of anyone but the author. For example, in the version of the "Noon-Piece" that appeared in the *Student*, *Delia* is changed to *Harriot*¹⁰; and the lines

On a bank of fragrant tanzey
Let us entertain our fancy
And with well disguised hook,
Cheat the tenants of the brook.

appear there as

On a bank of fragrant thyme,
Beneath yon shapely, shadowy pine,
We'll with the well-disguised hook
Cheat the tenants of the brook.¹¹

Such variations of text are not characteristic of careless transcribers or printers. The truth probably is that, whether by accident or intention, a more or less accurate copy found its way into the editor's hands; that, as time passed, Smart became aware of imperfections in the earlier version; and that he then made rather large alterations and took this means to save himself from the appearance of having printed his work before it was adequately polished, a literary vice of which Hill later accused him with more than a little justice. Wherever the truth may lie, it is clear that by 1748 he had gained the acquaintance of London men closely connected with the literary life of the city.

¹⁰ This is doubtless a reflection of his "long and unsuccessful passion" for Miss Harriot Pratt, of Downham in Norfolk; see Hunter, p. xxxiii. Allusions to this affair appear also in "Ode on the Fifth of December," "Ode to Lady Harriot," "The Lass with the Golden Locks," and "Lovely Harriot."

¹¹ Usually the changes in the later version are in the direction of better poetry technically, though at the same time, rather more stereotyped and more in accord with the poetic fashions of the day. Possibly had Smart not felt it necessary to conform as he did to those fashions, the contrast between the *Song* and the bulk of his work would not have been so great.

Though he had accomplished nothing spectacular as a writer before his arrival in London, there were reasons for his approaching his new career optimistically. His later work reveals a rather wide reading in English,¹² and his classical training was sufficient for him to write a quantity of original Latin verse and to make commendable translations both from and into Latin. In fact, considering its wide use by school-boys, his prose rendering of Horace was probably his best known work for years after his death; and before he went to London his version of Pope's ode was in its second edition and had gained him an encouraging but somewhat precise and studied note from its original author. He possessed, too, a ready pen and a fertile brain with which he could produce an almost unlimited supply of marketable, chiefly ephemeral nonsense. Moreover, he had had during his college days much practice in composition and must have earned the reputation of a promising writer; that belief best accounts for his having been chosen to write the Tripos poems on three occasions and for the later willingness of the authorities to have him keep his name on the books of the College gratis so long as he continued to write for the Seatonian prize.¹³ Later, the poems and translations on which that reputation rested often provided a stock of materials from which he drew in time of need. In Latin he had by him his three Tripos poems—*Datur Mundorum Pluralitas*, *Materies Gaudet Vi Inertiae*, and *Mutua Oscitationum Propagatio Solvi Potest Mechanice*—,¹⁴ a translation of Pope's "Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day," and others of the *Essay on Criticism*, which was undertaken on the advice of the author,¹⁵ and of some of Milton's verse. The latter two he had in 1746 announced as then "preparing for the press."¹⁶ In English there were his own "Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day," already printed in the second edition of the translation of Pope's "Ode"; the *Trip to Cambridge, or the Grateful Fair*, which had been acted in April, 1747; the "Secular Ode on the Jubilee at Pembroke

¹² McKenzie (*op. cit.*, pp 16 f.) presents an interesting list of Smart's borrowings from a Cambridge library. See also *Rejoice in the Lamb*, pp 24, 290; for that matter, the whole poem and the notes there supplied are a convincing demonstration of the depth of Smart's reading in some fields.

¹³ D. C. Tovey, *Notes and Queries*, Series X, Vol III, p 354.

¹⁴ These are items I, II, and III in G. J. Gray's "Bibliography of Christopher Smart" in *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, VI (London, 1903), pp 269-303. This bibliography is henceforth referred to as *Bib.*

¹⁵ Chalmers, XVI, 5.

¹⁶ At the end of the second edition of his translation of Pope's ode, which was listed as just published in the September number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*

College, Cambridge, in 1745"¹⁷; a poem "To the King," which had appeared in a Cambridge collection of complimentary poems in 1748¹⁸; and a large number of such smaller pieces as "The Pretty Bar-Keeper of the Mitre," "Idleness," "On Taking a Bachelor's Degree," and *The Rural Day*. Most important of all, he seems to have had the willingness to work tirelessly to make a place for himself in the turbulent literary life of the city. Not all his circumstances, however, were so favorable, for he had fallen into bad habits at Cambridge: Gray's letters are sufficiently explicit concerning his extravagance and drunkenness, and we scarcely need direct evidence to believe that he left Cambridge badly in debt, inasmuch as that seems long before to have become his normal state. All things considered, it can hardly be said that he was justified in expecting a greater success in London than he had achieved at Cambridge, yet that success had been considerable, and his equipment was better than average.

At that time, or somewhat before, Burney introduced him to Newbery,¹⁹ whom Murphy described in his *Essay on Johnson* as "a man of a projecting head, good taste, and great industry"; and shortly after Smart's arrival in London, the two formed a business connection and published the *Horatian Canons of Friendship*, an imitation of Horace, in time for it to be announced among the new books in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June, 1750. In the interim, he had been occupied with that, possibly with other work for Newbery's varied enterprises, and with at least one other piece, the Seatonian prize poem *On the Eternity of the Supreme Being*²⁰. The prize was granted him on March 25, 1750; and one feels certain that the £30, which was then the amount of the prize,²¹ was no less welcome than the honor. When *On the Eternity* was published, the pamphlet closed with a note which possibly hints further at his occupation during the preceding months: there he advertised a collection of his poems to be published by subscription²² and

¹⁷ Leonard Whibley, "The Jubilee at Pembroke Hall in 1743," *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCXXI (1927), 104-15. This poem appeared in the *Universal Visiter* (I, 39).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, VII.

¹⁹ Hunter, p. xviii. Smart is said by Austin Dobson (*Fanny Burney* [New York, 1903], p. 28) to have met Burney while the latter was at Arne's; that would place the beginning of the friendship between 1744 and 1747. If this be so, Burney may have been the "gentleman very eminent in the science of music" who requested that Smart write his song for St. Cecilia's Day.

²⁰ The first edition was announced in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of April, 1750.

²¹ Anderson, XI, 119.

²² This collection was also advertised in the *General Evening Post*, August 4, 1750.

to sell for a half guinea. Of the poems which are named for inclusion in the volume, "all ready for the Press," many were complete some time before he left Cambridge, but others—*The Hop Garden* and *The Judgment of Midas*, for example—may probably have been completed during his early months in London.

In *The Horatian Canons of Friendship*, the first of Smart's publications with which Newbery's name had been associated, Smart appeared as "Ebenezer Pentweazle, of Truro in the County of Cornwall, Esq." Of the two dedications, the one addressed to the Rev. Mr. William Warburton pokes rather amusing fun at Warburton's *Dunciad* and his edition of Shakespeare,²² remarking that they should be considered his, inasmuch as the original authors would certainly not own them. The other, directed to the "Trunk-Maker at the Corner of St. Paul's Church-Yard," who Pentweazle believes will use many of his works to line his product, suggests that trunkmakers should choose the materials for their linings with an eye to suitability: for example, pastorals and epigrams for the trunks of misses; epic, tragedy, and comedy for those of persons of condition, and Fielding for the trunks of an emperor! When one encounters this and many other, less ambiguous, compliments to Fielding in Smart's later works, one wonders how well and how early they may have known each other. Following these prefaces comes a note to assure the reader that Pentweazle does not reflect upon Mr. Nickless, evidently the trunkmaker, "who is an excellent artist in his way, and a very sensible worthy man." The back page of this pamphlet carries the announcement of *The History of Jack the Giant Killer* by nine-year-old Master Billy Pentweazle, whether or not Smart had a hand in this production, it may be suspected that he contributed to the advertisement with its mottoes in the nine languages which this child prodigy has mastered: Latin, "Et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent—Mart."; English; Greek; Welch, German, "Wer is der Edelman?"; French, "Hon! soit qui mal y pense"; Spanish, "Adonde esta el orinal, adonde esta la privada?"; Italian; and Flemish. This is exactly the sort of foolery for which Smart seems to have had a vast relish.

At about the same time comes the first evidence of his connection with the *Student, or the Oxford Monthly Miscellany*, five issues of which Newbery and J. Barrett of Oxford had already published and

²² The text also contains a gibe or two at Warburton

to which Thomas Warton, Richard Rolt, and Bonnell Thornton also contributed. With the sixth number, issued on June 30, the title changed to the *Student, or the Oxford and Cambridge Monthly Miscellany*, and there was printed the "Ode on the fifth of December, being the birthday of a very beautiful young lady. By Mr. Christopher Smart." There also appeared the first of the Chimæricus Cantabrigien-sis papers on castle-building, a series which continued regularly until the magazine ceased publication in July, 1751. That Smart was the castle-builder is suggested by the character of the essays; the author's allusion to himself as a small man, a physical peculiarity to which Smart elsewhere referred in a jocular fashion²⁴; and Kenrick's apparent ascription of the series to him in the *Old Woman's Dunciad*²⁵; but this evidence is certainly not conclusive. Be that as it may, however, Smart's incontestable contributions are numerous. The following number contains "Sweet William," the first portion of the revised *Rural Day*, and "Christopherus Smart Samueli Saunders Col. Regal. S. P. D.," and the August issue the second part of the *Rural Day*, "The Distressed Damsel,"²⁶ "Inscriptions on an Aeolian Harp," and "On Taking a Bachelor's Degree." Thereafter he continued to contribute until the *Student* was no longer published; during that time were printed five pieces over the name of Mr. Lun: "The Author Apologizes to a Lady for His Being a Little Man," "The Decision," "The Pretty Bar-Keeper of the Mitre," "The Widow's Resolution," and "To Miss *****," one of the Chichester Graces," all of which are printed in the 1791 edition of his poems and three of which Smart included in his *Poems on Several Occasions* (1752). In addition, there appeared in the later numbers of the *Student* the third part of the *Rural Day*, Pentweazle's "Epigram Extempore on a Cold Poet,"²⁷ "Ode to the Reverend and Learned Dr. Webster," the

²⁴ In "The Author Apologizes to a Lady for His Being a Little Man." See also the *Midwife* (II, 146), where in a sketch discussing the physical degeneration of mankind in 1931 is mentioned "one Smart, who tho' but four Feet high would now be esteem'd a Giant." Cp. *Rejoice in the Lamb*, p. 75.

²⁵ See the passages quoted on p. 19.

²⁶ On this first appearance of "The Distressed Damsel," it is said to be by "Miss Nellie Pentweazle, a young lady of fifteen," and a footnote explains that she is the "only daughter to Ebenezer Pentweazle of Truro in the County of Cornwall, Esq.; who lately obliged the publick with that excellent work, The Horatian Canons of Friendship." When it was used again in the first number of the *Midwife*, there is a footnote acknowledging its previous appearance in the *Student*.

²⁷ Assigned to Smart by Gray (*Bib.*, p. 275). Inasmuch as there were two Pentweazles (see p. 16 *post*) and the epigram is directed against Rolt, with whom Smart seems to have been friendly, the ascription is open to doubt.

prologue to *The Grateful Fair*,²⁰ a letter from Mary Midnight, the author of the *Midwife*, "To the ingenious Authors of the Student," enclosing the epigram "The Miser and the Mouse," "The Fair Recluse," "On Seeing the Picture of Miss R--- G---n, Drawn by Mr. [Willem?] Verelst of Threadneedle Street," "Ode to an Eagle confin'd in a College-Court,"²¹ and "On the Sudden Death of a Clergyman." Moreover, it is more than likely that he contributed other pieces, either anonymously or under other pen names; the evidence is all but conclusive that the essays signed "The Female Student" are his.²²

On October 16, 1750, the *Midwife, or the Old Woman's Magazine* made its first appearance²³ and, it would seem, was continued thereafter monthly with some delays until early in 1752, when without warning the series closed. It was "printed for Mary Midnight and Sold by T. Carnan," Newbery's stepson and Smart's future brother-in-law. Though Smart was certainly the chief contributor, Newbery is said to have had a hand in the writing,²⁴ and the pamphlet *The Magazines Blown Up* intimates that someone else—perhaps Bonnell Thornton—concealed himself in "the Petticoats of an *old Woman*."²⁵ Richard Roit seems also to have supplied some material; at least the note to line 182

²⁰ It has no signature and is headed simply "Prologue to a Play intended for the Stage."

²¹ II, 356 f. June, 1751. Though the poem itself is dated May 5, 1751, the allusion to it in the *Old Woman's Dunciad* (see p. 19 *post*) suggests that it had been written and given some sort of publicity before that date. His adoption of a new pen name for it, Zosimus Zephyrinus, suggests that at this time he may not have cared to appear as an open critic of college affairs; yet it was only a couple of months later that the *Midwife* (II, 215, 220) contains material that is equally critical.

²² McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

²³ "The first number of our imperial, superb, and pompous Magazine, was published no longer ago than the 16th of October, 1750 O. S." *Midwife*, I, 66. The last three numbers (II, III, and IV of Vol. III), which should normally have been published in November and December, 1751, and January, 1752, appeared late. Mr. E. G. Ainsworth, Jr., who has given me several most helpful suggestions, points out evidence in the *General Advertiser* for Jan. 1 and 20, 1752, that the second number of Volume III appeared somewhat later than January 7; and number IV contains material which is clearly much later. However, nothing is said in the magazine to indicate that the series was interrupted, and number III has the usual 36 pages. It may well be that the last three numbers were published late but with a fair degree of regularity and that, when preparations were being made late in 1752 to issue the third volume, material was added to, or substituted in, the last number, which contains 44 pages, in order to bring this volume, with the inclusion of the *Index of Mankind*, to a bulk comparable to that of the other two.

²⁴ "Mr. Newbery and himself [Smart] were the chief, if not the only contributors." Hunter, p. xix.

²⁵ See p. 16 *post*.

of the *Pasquinade* lists "*the Gossip's Chronicle in the Old Woman's Magazine*" among his works. The first volume was collected and published about the last of May, 1751; the second late in the same year; and the third sometime after March 31, 1753. As a whole, the magazine contains considerable lively, amusing material, such as the epigram alluding to the long run of *Romeo and Juliet* at both theatres and Pentweazle's epigram "On a Woman who was singing Ballads for Money to bury her dead Husband", in that respect it is a tribute to Smart's abilities as a humorist and to his industry. The reader finds, however, little of much literary import.

Besides revealing literary qualities characteristic of much of Smart's work, its contents illustrate admirably Smart's devices for increasing the curiosity of the public concerning publications in which he was interested. In this art, he probably learned much from Newbery, but one feels that he was a student of no slight aptitude.³⁴ The preface of the *Midwife* is followed by the note

The above was written by our ingenious and truly worthy Friend, Ferdinando Foot, Esq, who is about to publish a new and curious Collection of Jests, Epigrams, Epitaphs, &c which will do great Honour to the British Nation

When that was printed, *The Nutcracker* was soon to be offered for sale in Newbery's shop. Likewise, the *Student* is well advertised. When "*The Distressed Damself*" appeared in the first number of the *Midwife*, it was followed by a cross-reference to the *Student*; the reader of the second number is sent to one of the Chimæricus Cantabrigiensis papers for an explanation of *plumpers*, "One instance of a Man's being honest" has the note: "The ingenious Authors of the *Student* would do well to discountenance this Vice", and the second volume advertises the *Student* as an "admirable Collection" containing "A Letter from Mr. R. B-----'s Dog, Colebrook, to Timothy Beck"³⁵ and "The Adventures of a Goose-Quill. In the manner of Mrs. Midnight's Tye-Wig." Once the *Student* is mentioned as selling well; the reader is likely to reflect that, if it were not, Smart need not have felt that he was at fault. Subsequently Mrs. Midnight quoted from

the *Horatian-Canons of Friendship*, publish'd by my good Friend Mr *Newbery*, in *St Paul's Church-yard* — The Reader will find in the subsequent Extract, several good and facetious Rules for making and confirming Friendships, which

³⁴ McKenzie (*op cit*, pp 61 f) remarks upon similar publicity given Smart, the *Midwife*, and Newbery in the *Student*

³⁵ Concerning Timothy Beck, see Wilbur L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), II, 266 f

I heartily recommend to the Perusal and the Practice of all those who chuse to call themselves my Friends."

Finally, in the third volume, there are several appropriately timed allusions to the Clare Market oratory of John Henley and the rival concern which Mrs. Midnight was shortly to open.

Not only did Mrs. Midnight take pains to advertise Smart's work, but she also made frequent complimentary references to his contemporaries, some of them already Smart's friends and others men with whom he doubtless wished to associate on friendly terms. Charles Burney, later most active in Smart's behalf, wrote the music for *Queen Mab*; when it was at the height of its considerable popularity, a full account of the piece was given in the *Midwife*.¹⁷ Likewise, Johnson's *Rambler*, then appearing, was alluded to in complimentary terms each month in a footnote to the essay which Mrs. Midnight borrowed from the series¹⁸; once, for example, it was referred to thus: "*A Paper publish'd every Tuesday and Saturday, price 2 d., which is worthy the Patronage of all Gentlemen of Taste and Genius*" Garrick, too, was at least under siege if he had not already capitulated: the first issue of the *Midwife* printed "The New Occasional Prologue, spoken at the Opening of Drury-Lane Theatre, by Mr Garrick"; the second contains a letter to Garrick complimenting him on his many benefit performances during the past winter but suggesting certain alterations in the repertoire of his company; he was again referred to in the fourth number;

¹⁷ II, 169 f. Mrs. Midnight presented the extract as a piece of poetry "in which I conceived there was Merit."

¹⁸ In the *Inspector*, a sort of news magazine appended to the *Student*, the readers are referred for further information concerning *Queen Mab* "to the facetious and ingenious Mrs. Midnight, who has given a most diverting narrative thereof in the fourth number of her magazine."

¹⁹ The *Student*, in which Johnson's *Life of Cheynel* was soon to be published serially, remarked "We beg leave to return our acknowledgments, for the noble and rational entertainments he has given us, to the admirable author of the RAMBLER, a work that exceeds any thing of the kind ever published in this kingdom, some of the SPECTATORS excepted—if indeed they may be excepted. We own ourselves unequal to the task of commending such a work up to its merits—where the diction is the most high-wrought imaginable, and yet, like the brilliancy of a diamond, exceeding perspicuous in its richness—where the sentiments enoble the style, and the style familiarizes the sentiments—where every thing is easy and natural, yet every thing is masterly and strong. May the publick favours crown his merits, and may not the *English*, under the auspicious reign of GEORGE the second, neglect a man, who, had he lived in the first century, would have been one of the greatest favourites of AUGUSTUS" This was reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (October, 1750), and certain of the less fulsome sentences are quoted by Boswell in his discussion of the *Rambler*.

That Smart wrote this is highly conjectural, yet in the light of his habits of commendation and of the fact that he was soon to reprint a *Rambler* each month, the possibility is worth notice.

and in the sixth was printed the prologue to *Alfred*, which he had spoken. As time went on, Mrs. Midnight continued her flattering interest in the theater. Furthermore, the name of Mrs. Midnight's bookseller, T. Carnan, frequently appeared, and once she noticed at some length a collection of songs, *The Muses Banquet*, which he offered for sale, even printing "*Directions to enable Ladies and Gentlemen to sing in a pleasing and graceful Manner.*"³⁸ Of Newbery even more frequent mention was made: at one time his project for improving the poor was praised; again "To the Memory of Master ****," which later appeared under the title of "On the Death of Master Newbery after a lingering Illness," was printed; and elsewhere it was the "*beautiful Edition in English*" of More's *Utopia*, which Newbery was shortly to publish, that was spoken of.⁴⁰ To Fielding, from whose farce *Miss Lucy in Town* some would have it the name of Mary Midnight was derived,⁴¹ attention was frequently given; his characters, the Universal Register Office, and his *Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers &c.* were all discussed. Arthur Murphy, too, came in for his share of attention when, in the last number of the third volume, Mrs. Midnight congratulated the public on the revival and continuation of the *Craftsman* "by a Gentleman and a Scholar"; and it was surely with the purpose of gratifying Murphy, who had reproved Hill for the violence of his attack on Smart, that she inserted "a Paper taken out at random from the *Chapter Coffee-house File*" and remarked that as "my best judgment has been satisfied and pleased with them all, I cannot presume to say which is best."⁴² So it went, with Chesterfield, Rolt, Ben Sedgely, Collins, Thomas Warton, and Mason, among others, all pleasantly referred to, some of them repeatedly. Though it certainly is not to be

³⁸ At the end of Newbery's edition of More's *Utopia* was announced "The Muses Banquet; or, A Present from Parnassus: Being a Collection of such English and Scotch Songs as are well worth preserving. Songs that are perfectly decent, that have some Scope and Design, and that tend either to improve the Mind, mend the Manners, or make the Heart merry To which is prefix'd by way of Introduction, such Directions as will enable People to sing in a Graceful and becoming manner. . . In two neat Pocket Volumes, Price bound 2 s. 6 d."

³⁹ Newbery's edition is dated Oxford, 1751; on the last pages are advertised *The Actor*, *the Student*, and *The Muses Banquet*.

⁴⁰ In the *Dictionary of National Biography* it is suggested that the name came from a booth at Bartholemew Fair. From the fact that the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February and March, 1748, announces the publication of the first and second parts of *A Spy on Mother Midnight; or, the Templar Metamorphos'd*, it would seem that readers already knew something of her before Smart began to use the name.

⁴¹ The paper selected is dated March 31, 1753

argued that Smart numbered among his friends all the men to whom complimentary allusion was made, the indications seem clear that he would have been willing to, had there been opportunity, and that he knew something of the power of a well-turned compliment to promote such opportunities.

Meanwhile, in 1750, Smart had begun to attract notice for which he appears to have had little relish. William Kenrick, in the *Kapélion*, or *Poetical Ordinary*, printed an epigram "Occasion'd by the Night Piece, or, Modern Philosophy of Mr. Christopher Smart":

The Moon shone bright! yet dark the Night!
Sure Kist has miss'd the Mark!
Oh — No — 'tis right — he wanted Light
To see — that it was dark

This was followed by the note:

The above must not be look'd on as an Attempt to depreciate the Merit of Mr *Smart*; but only to shew him how cautious those should be in condemning the Works of others, who are liable to such gross Failures themselves, it being undoubtedly a true Observation, according to Mr *Pope*, that there never was any Thing so absurd or ridiculous, but what has at some Time or other been wrote, even by some Author of establish'd Reputation — a Reflection, as may not be improper for Writers to make (continues he) as it is at once some Mortification to their Vanity, as well as Comfort to their Infirmary See the last Annotation to the fourth Book of his *Homer's Iliad*^a

How Smart had incurred the resentment of Kenrick by "condemning the Works of others," whether orally or in print, is uncertain; but this and Kenrick's other attacks doubtless explain a certain testiness of tone in Smart's allusion to *Kapélions*.⁴⁴

Presumably it was about this time that a more elaborate satire on Smart appeared. The title-page of this three-penny pamphlet, probably from the pen of Kenrick, shows something of its content and method:

THE/ Magazines blown up;/ OR,/ They are all in the SUDS/ Being a full and true Account of the appre-/ hending and taking of the notified *Pent-wease*, an OXFORD SCHOLAR; in the Shape/ of an OLD WOMAN With his Examination/ before the Right Worshipful Justice BAN-/ TER [Whimsey Banter's name is signed to the introduction of the *Kapélion*], and his Commitment to THE *New-Prison* / Together with an Account of his Impeachment of/ divers others, who were concern'd in many late/ barbarous Attempts on the Senses of his Ma-/ jesty's liege Subjects. — With a *right* and *true*/ List of all their Names, who were taken, last/ Night, at a House of ill Fame near St.

^a P. 153.

⁴⁴ *Midwife*, I, 207.

ing number. Conjecture, however, is unnecessary; a glance at the poem, announced as newly published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1751, clinches the matter: it is a detailed attack upon Smart by one who appears to have known his activities well. What was doubtless more galling, the writer turned his own words against Smart; he built upon the foundation of publicity Smart had prepared, insisted that he was the one and original Mary Midnight and not one of the imposters who have been recently abroad, and even charged that the true Mrs. Midnight's enemies, Pentweazle among them, had had the assurance to advertise an *Old Woman's Dunciad* of their own. But the title-page and a quotation or two from Margelina Scribelinda Macularia's preface tell this part of the story well:

The so much talk'd of and expected/ Old Woman's DUNCIAD / OR,/ MID-WIFE'S MASTER-PIECE/ CONTAINING/ The most choice Collection of *Humdrums* and *Drivellers*,/ that was ever expos'd to public View./ BY/ MARY MIDNIGHT./ WITH/ Historical, Critical, and Explanatory NOTES,/ BY/ Margelina Scribelinda Macularia./ [Mottoes from Barrow, Gay, and Pope]/ Publish'd pursuant to Act of Parliament, as the greatest Work ever/ before attempted in any Age, Country, or Language / LONDON:/ Printed for Theo. Carnan [the reader should recall Mrs. Midnight's protest that her pieces were to be printed by T. Carnan], and sold by F Stamper, in Pope's Head Alley/ Cornhill; J ROBINSON, at the Golden-Lion, Ludgate-street; R. Willson,/ in Pall-Mall; and at all the Pamphlet-Shops. MDCCLI.

As there are so many Imposters and Imitators Abroad, it is highly requisite the Public should be satisfied, that this is the true and genuine *Dunciad* of Mrs. Mary Midnight; to which End I have wrote this short Preface. . . .

To reward, among many others, the Authors of such Proceedings [the spurious Mary Midnights] in a Manner due to their Deserts, Mrs. *Midnight* has design'd and executed this Work, but, as an Affair of so much Consequence could not but get Air in the World, several of these, who were conscious of their Guilt, applied to her to be excus'd a Place, or, in other Words, to be left out of her *Dunciad*. Among which came the celebrated *Pentweazle*, and meanly offer'd her *five Guineas* in part, on Subscription to her Miscellany of Poems, to be publish'd some Time in February next.⁵⁰ But Mrs. *Midnight* being above any mercenary View, was deaf to all Overtures, however considerable, of this kind. Upon which, with their usual Assurance, her Enemies advertis'd even this intended Work, the *Old Woman's Dunciad*, in her's and in my Name, intending to impose some Trumpery or other on the World, before this Poem could appear, and, with the most consummate Impudence, put out Advertisements against the fictitious Imitators of Mrs. *Midnight's* Works, to outface, if possible, the very Truth itself. But we have, thro' a surprising Quickness of Genius, peculiar to our Author, anticipated their Designs, to their utter Confusion: Since the

⁵⁰ It would seem that Smart had made some such charge against Kendrick.

World will, by reading the following Work, be convinc'd of the genuine and elevated Spirit of Mrs. *Midnight*, and will not, for the future, be so easily impos'd on.

All this must have been most annoying to Smart, left as he probably was with his own *Dunciad* in his pocket.⁵¹

The body of the work is made up of three parts: the *Dunciad* itself in bombastically "elevated" blank verse, a running "Interpretation" in octosyllabics, and elaborate notes. This typical section, describing Smart as Dullness' owl, reveals both the character of the work and the detailed knowledge of Smart's activities the author possessed.

And he [Smart], in Cell sublime, a Bird of Night,
Screams hideous, or, in Dormitation mounts
Aquiline Wings, and in Etherial Space
Builds castral Edifices Or he's pent,
In Shape Mustelar, to the Goddess' Use
Subservient; or, perverted into Form
Anicular, he verrates coenal Trash,
With miscellaneous Art; cracks kernell'd Nuts
Or mumbles Grace twice o'er; and grinning shews
His toothless Gums. Ah void of Pow'r to hurt!⁵²

In the "Interpretation" the allusions to the "Ode to an Eagle confin'd in a College-Court," the Chimæricus Cantabrigiensis papers in the *Student*, Pentweazle's activities, the *Midwife*, and the recently published *Nutcracker* are transparent:

And he, aloft, a screech Owl, screams!
Or gets into his tantrum Dreams,
Fancies himself an Eagle there,
And raises Castles in the Air;
Or else, into a Weazle Pent,
He serves the Goddess's intent.
Or else, in an old Woman seen,
Sweeps Rubbish for a *Magazine*
Cracks Nuts that have been crack'd before,
Or, toothless, mumbles Grace twice o'er⁵³

⁵¹ The events are summarized thus in a note to line 183 of the *Pasquinade* "His [Kenrick's] *Old Woman's Dunciad* is an extraordinary instance of that impetuosity of Genius, which tho' redounding little to his honour is very offensive to his adversaries. — Mr. *Smart* having advertised an *Old Woman's Dunciad*, and given out, that this writer would share the benefit of his satire, he immediately wrote that piece, and published it under the same title After which Mr. *Smart* never prosecuted his design of publishing his poem"

⁵² As Mr. Ainsworth remarks, there is evident direct parody here of Smart's fondness for sonorous classical words, a tendency which is particularly marked in his Seatonian poems The "Interpretation" is in the metre of Smart's fables

⁵³ Pp. 15-17.

The notes on the passage are scarcely necessary for the reader's understanding; yet some of them drive home the points still further and others contribute additional information:

And who knows but her [Dullness] Owl may be in as bad a situation as Mr. *Smart*, who wanted Light to see that it was dark, as a late Epigram intimates — See *Kapiton*, No 4

The note on "Cracks kernell'd nuts" alludes to *The Nutcracker* in phrases that follow *Smart*'s announcements closely:

Some of our Readers may perhaps imagine here are meant Nuts with Kernels in them—to free them from that Mistake, I beg leave to assure them that Mrs *Midnight* means Nuts without Kernels, as is expressed in the Interpretation To come at the true and full Meaning of the Text, it is necessary we subjoin the following Advertisement given out by the fictitious, &c To make you all merry at *Christmas*, and to open the New Year with Pleasure and satisfaction, my Publisher will exhibit on the 26th of this Instant, to all who are pleased to purchase the same, A most admirable, learned, and judicious Work intitled,

The NUT-CRACKER Containing an agreeable Variety of well-season'd Jests, Epigrams, Epitaphs, &c collected from the most *Sprightly Wits* of the present Age. Together with such Instructions as will enable any Man to tell a Story with a good Grace, and crack a *Nut* without losing the *Kernel*. With other Particulars equally useful and entertaining, and for which the gentle, kind, and courteous Reader, will be pleased to look into the Book itself Published with the Approbation of the Learned in all Faculties, by Ferdinando Foot, Esq ,

Now, Reader, these Nuts, here so bragged of, have been cracked before by *Joe Miller*, and the whole Tribe of Nut-crackers, who have been wise enough to secure the Kernels

The double grace is explained as his having used the same preface for the *Old Woman's Magazine* and the "above *Nutcracker*" Concerning "And grinning shows" the remark is made that:

Mrs *Midnight* here seems to point at some late Advertisements [doubtless *Smart*'s own], put out in her Name, by the fictitious Attempters to her Humour and Genius; which, as they are remarkable Instances of the Confidence of these People, we shall give an Instance or two

ADVERTISEMENT

WHEREAS several egregious Idots have been flinging Dirt at Mrs *Midnight* and her Works The Publick is desired to take Notice, that there is now in the Press, and speedily will be published, the *Old Woman's Dunciad* with Notes

THE Gentleman who sent five Guineas to be excused a Place, or, in other Words, to be left out of my *Dunciad*, is desired to call at my Publisher's and receive his Money, for, upon Enquiry, he appears to be such an egregious Blockhead, and is in all Respects so fit for Celebration, that I can't prevail on myself to omit any Character which will afford my Friends such high Entertainment

The Reader is here desired to recollect, or turn back to the Preface⁴⁴

In other sections, the poem satirizes Rolt, T. Carnan, who is said to be "not the true and genuine Theophilus Carnan, Mrs. Midnight's only Bookseller," *The Rosciad*,⁴⁵ *The Actor*, and a person from Oxford—perhaps Thornton—who had founded the *Student*, helped with the *Midwife*, and was then engaged on a tragedy.

It can scarcely be wondered that Smart should attack Kenrick when opportunity offered; in the April number of the *Midwife*, he charged that he, along with Stamper,⁴⁶ had caught the "itch of scribbling"; in addition, he accused Kenrick of being unable to blush, made repeated allusions to rulers and pencils, and, with well-chosen quotations, exhibited the literary qualities of Kenrick's *Monody* on the death of the Prince of Wales, which was listed among the new publications in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1751. At best, however, Smart must have felt that he had come off a poor second in his first major literary engagement.

Meanwhile, he was busy. In addition to continuing his contributions to the *Student* until July, 1751, and carrying the *Midwife* on into the next year, he also found time for much miscellaneous work. He collected *The Nutcracker* and published it late in December, 1750,⁴⁷ with, as Kenrick noted, the same preface as the *Midwife*. The performance on March 7 of *Othello* "by persons of distinction for their diversion" gave him opportunity to gain further attention. One of the moving spirits of the enterprise was John Delaval, who during his brief career at Cambridge had been Smart's student. At the request of him and his brother Francis, Smart supplied an occasional prologue and epilogue, and enjoyed and encouraged whatever favor they brought him.⁴⁸ Before March 16, a second edition of the two pieces, with a dedication to John and Francis Delaval was printed to be sold by New-

⁴⁴ Pp 10, 15-17

⁴⁵ Probably by Rolt, it was reviewed adversely in the December, 1750, issue of the *Monthly Review* and quoted concerning Garrick in the *Midwife* (II, 79)

⁴⁶ F. Stamper had published Kenrick's *Monody* and his *Fun*, and was likewise one of the booksellers mentioned on the title-page of the *Old Woman's Dunciad*

⁴⁷ The date is established by the fact that *The Nutcracker* must have preceded the *Old Woman's Dunciad*, the publication of which was announced in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1751. It was advertised in the *General Evening Post* of November 23, 1750

⁴⁸ For accounts of the performance, see the *Gentleman's Magazine* (March, 1751), pp 119 ff. In the first of these reviews the prologue is characterized as excellent, but the announcement of their publication (p 142 f) has a distinctly unfriendly tone

bery," and by the end of the year a third edition had appeared.⁸⁰ They were printed again, with suitable preliminary correspondence between Smart and Mrs. Midnight, in the March issue of the *Midwife*, and later in the same number it was recounted that

On Thursday the 7th of this Instant, the Tragedy of Othello was perform'd at Drury Lane Theatre, to the most brilliant Audience that perhaps ever was assembled upon any Occasion. The whole Performance was truly admirable, and merited all the Applause that was or could be given it.

An almost identically worded item appears in the *Inspector*, the news magazine already mentioned in connection with the *Student*. It is easy to understand that Smart was proud to have his name brought to the attention of the Prince of Wales and all the other members of this brilliant audience; some of his contemporaries seem, however, to have found his pride somewhat amusing.

Shortly afterwards, on March 20, Frederick, Prince of Wales, died, and Smart's *Solemn Dirge, Sacred to the Memory of His Royal Highness* was written and sung, with the music of John Worgan, at Vauxhall. It was published, with a dedication to Prince George, in time for announcement in the April number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* and went into a third edition before the end of the year. In the May issue one finds a notice of his Seatonian poem of the year, *On the Immensity of the Supreme Being*, which had been assigned the award on April 20. The announcement is accompanied by a critical note, certainly not complimentary and perhaps somewhat antagonistic.⁸¹ Nor

⁸⁰ The date of this edition is indicated by the advertisement which appeared at the end "N B The Sixth Number of the MIDWIFE, or the Old Woman's Magazine, will certainly be published the 16th of this Instant March; and will complete the First Volume of that elaborate Undertaking, so necessary for all Families, and for Gentlemen and Ladies Pockets—The Price is only Three Pence a Number"

⁸¹ *Bib.*, XV, XVI, XVII Gray also lists "A Satirical Dialogue between A Sea Captain and his Friend in town; humbly addressed to the Gentlemen who deform'd the Play of Othello, on Th--rs--y, M---- the 7th, 1751, at the Th--tre R--y-l, in Dr--y L--ne to which is added, A Prologue and Epilogue, much more suitable to the occasion than their Own" To judge by the title and the sample of the prologue, said to be by Pentweazle, which Gray gives, this is a satirical paraphrase designed to annoy the noble performers of the play and to strike Smart in a vulnerable spot A selection from this piece is included in the announcement of its publication in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (March, 1751), p 142.

⁸² The short comment in the *Monthly Review* (IV, 508 ff) is kinder "Mr. Smart has already gained so much reputation by several other small pieces publish'd in the *Student*, or otherwise, that it would be superfluous in us to say more of his character as a poet . . . Mr. Smart has kept the divine poet the *Psalmist* in his eye, almost through the whole of this work, and finely imitated him in several passages"

were these all; Mrs. Midnight's *Index to Mankind* was published in June, or slightly before,⁸² receiving, in the July issue of the *Midwife*, appropriate publicity through a protest lodged there against some of its maxims by certain tradesmen. Likewise in June was advertised the second number of Newbery's *Lilliputian Magazine*, among the contents of which was "A Morning Hymn for all little, good Boys and Girls, which is also proper for People of riper Years, by Mr. Kitty Smart."⁸³ How close was Smart's connection with the *Lilliputian Magazine* is uncertain, but it may not be without significance that in the July, 1751, number of the *Midwife* Mrs. Midnight announced herself as the friend and heir of Lemuel Gulliver.

Enough has surely been said to show that the season of 1750-51 was a busy one for Smart and that he was doing well at his task of finding a place for himself in literary London, even though the place was not particularly exalted. With the fruits of his unremitting labor and the aid afforded him by the Seatonian prize money and the allowances occasionally granted him by the Cambridge authorities,⁸⁴ he should have been living in frugal comfort had he curbed his convivial tendencies sternly enough.

For some time after the spring of 1751 less work appeared which has been identified as his. The last number of the *Student* was published in July; and, though the *Midwife* continued, it is not until November, when we learn from it that the Old Woman's Oratory was in preparation, that any other activity of his becomes evident. This theatrical entertainment, which owed its title to the notice Orator Henley was receiving, is said to have been begun as a joint venture of Smart and Newbery⁸⁵; later others most probably had a hand in the work. Smart's interest in the theater and theatrical people as well as his evident relish, to judge from one of Gray's letters, in writing, directing, and acting in *The Grateful Fair* suggest that he may even have played a part in the *Old Woman's Oratory*. Even though his precise connection is uncertain, contemporary allusions make clear that it was close. Of the nature of the performance, we learn most easily from advertisements which appeared in the newspapers shortly after we first hear of it in the *Midwife*.

⁸² *Gentleman's Magazine* (June, 1751).

⁸³ *London Daily Advertiser* for Saturday, June 29, 1751.

⁸⁴ Edmund Gosse, *Cambridge Review*, *loc cit*

⁸⁵ Anderson, *op. cit.*, XI, 120.

To-morrow the 3d inst. will be exhibited in the Great Room at the Castle Tavern in Pater-noster-Row, A GRAND CONCERT of VOCAL and INSTRUMENTAL MUSICK, BY several EMINENT HANDS. At the same time will be Opened, and given gratis, THE OLD WOMAN'S ORATORY: OR, HENLEY IN PETTICOATS To be Conducted by Mrs. MIDNIGHT, Author of the MIDWIFE, And her FAMILY. N. B. There will be FOUR ORATIONS, After the First of which, Signior ANTONIO AMBROSIANO, from Naples, will perform A CONCERTO on the CREMONA STACCATO, Vulgarly called the SALT-BOX. After the Second, will be presented, A GREAT CREATURE, On a very Uncommon Instrument. After the Third, A Solo on the Viol d'Amore, and another Piece by the GREAT CREATURE. Then the Candles will be snuffed to soft Musick by Signior Claudio Molepitano, For his Diversion, being the First Tune of any Gentleman's appearing in that Character. And the whole will conclude with an Oration by OLD TIME in favour of Matrimony; a Solo on the Violin-cello by CUPID in propria persona; and a Song to the Tune of the Roast Beef of Old England; to which all the good Company are desired to join in Chorus. N. B. No Admittance without Tickets, which are to be had at the Bedford Coffeehouse, Covent-Garden, and at the Place of Performance at 2s 6d. each Vivat Rex"

The second performance was advertised for December 27 at the New Theatre in the Haymarket, when a "Water-Piece" by Handel was to be part of the program, and on December 28 the same announcement appeared for the third performance on Monday, December 30. On February 4 the ninth performance took place at the Castle Tavern; then the grand concert was given by gentlemen masked "after the Manner of Grecian and Roman Comedy." A special point is made in the advertising that "the Room will be made very warm, and illuminated with Wax Lights." This venture appears to have caught the attention of the public and to have been successful, more so than Chalmers was inclined to believe⁶⁷; at any rate, the performance continued and was

⁶⁷ London Daily Advertiser, Monday, December 2, 1751.

⁶⁸ *Op cit*, p 8. There is evident allusion to the Oratory in the advertising of *Pasquin Turn'd Drawcansir*, a dramatic satire of Fielding's quarrel with Hill (see G. E. Jensen's edition of *The Covent-Garden Journal*, I, 71 f.). In the advertisement of Kenrick's proposed performance of *Fun* (1752), the parody of Mrs. Midnight's advertising is so close that she was moved to deny any connection with the scheme (*ibid.*, I, 61 f.).

Though Fielding is the chief butt of the piece, Smart and his works, particularly the Old Woman's Oratory, receive some attention. In the Preface the author complains that the intended performance at the Castle Tavern was suppressed though at the same time "*the same Privilege had been permitted an old Woman of a very bad Character, one Mother Midnight, who had often practis'd her Profession there, tho' it was now denied others*" (p. iii). Later, in a scene parodying one of the heath scenes in *Macbeth*, as three witches are throwing ingredients for their brew into the cauldron, one remarks (p. 5)

Here a poor Birth-strangled Babe,
Ditch-deliver'd by a Drab;

revived in following seasons until at least as late as March, 1760. For the eleventh presentation on February 10, the ladies were desired to come early that they "may be accommodated with the best Seats, and not be crowded as they were several Nights past." By March 21 the benefit performances began; among those honored thus were Signor Bombasto, Signor Piantofugo, Mr. Toe, and Mr. Noell, all members of the company, and "a Widow Gentlewoman in Distress." Then on May 2 came the "Last Night," which "By particular Desire of several Ladies of Quality" was followed on May 5 by what was advertised as "positively the last night." Thereafter there were not less than four more final performances, on May 7, 12, 21, and 23—"at the particular Request of several Persons of Quality."⁸⁸ At next to the last of these it was promised that "Mrs. Midnight will give Caudle" and "Mons. TIMBERTOE, from the Opera House in Paris, will present the good

Child of Poverty and Spleen,
Mother Midnight's Magazine

Afterwards the *Student* is added to the brew "to make it stronger." Not until Scene IV, headed "*A Specimen of TRUE ORATORY*," however, does Smart come in for a major share of attention. There Orator, "alias the Brazen Head," soliloquizes. The ejaculatory manner of his speech would seem to be a direct satire of Orator Henley and what he says may well reflect Henley's resentment of *Mother Midnight's* activities. Even so, it is clear that Kenrick expected some of the ridicule to fall upon Smart.

"Old Women the Pests of the Creation—what constitutes them? Ignorance and a College Education — University itself an old Woman — Want of Impudence want of Sense — no Man beside myself e'er dar'd to say so — Nonsense — Puns — Quibbles — Conundrums — *Smart Sayings* — *St. Paul's Church-yard* and *Grub-street* the same Place — Puffs — *Horses*, the Consumers of Oats, gone to draw the *Asses* to *Mother Midnight's Oratory* — long Ears best to taste the Music of the Salt-box — In my humble Opinion they are got on the wrong Side of the Post there — *Mary Midnight* not herself — See the *Old Woman's Dunciad* — What signifies her pretending to stand up for her own Existence? She don't exist at all — I can prove it —"

[There follow a couple of paragraphs in which he speaks of Roxana Termagant, among others, and then]

"*Mother Midnight* made Use of unfair Weapons — Salt-boxes! Why does a Salt-box make her a better *Man*? Why I can get five Salt-boxes, and then I am five times as good as she — Solo on a Broom-stick — did you ever hear a Dog sing — Signor *Canini* from *Bologna* — come forth — now trust your Ears —

Here a Song by a Dog

There's the masterly — the grand Coup — the ev'ry Thing — Music itself no more than Sound, Sound no more than Noise — I myself a good Musician — perhaps a little harsh to old Women or so — but come — Signor *Canini* renew the Strain —

Dog sings again

— Conviction! now who's Conqueror? *Epaminondas* a great Man — I much like him — have been up long enough since I go down unconquer'd —"

⁸⁸ Mr. Ainsworth informs me that he found record of a performance on May 24

Company with a Dance." For the performance on the 23rd, "Mons. Timbertoe" was again announced, and there was added "an Egyptian Concerto on the Bells of Bacchus." On the morning of this performance this verse appeared in the London *Daily Advertiser*, which regularly carried Mrs. Midnight's advertising:

*On seeing the incomparable Mons. TIMBERTOE dance
at Mrs MIDNIGHT'S Oratory*

Behold great TIMBERTOE — illustrious Name!
Exalts the Dance, and capers into Fame.
Tho' his Left Leg a Victim fell to Fate,
His right officiates for its absent Mate;
And with a Wooden Supplement engages,
All Tastes, all Ranks, all Sexes, and all Ages.
Each Fair is dubious, which should win her Heart,
The Limb of Nature, or the Stump of Art;
And smiles to see this active Artist do,
More with one Foot than others can with two

Lewis Lun.

Knowing something of Smart's taste in *jeux d'esprit* and recalling his earlier use of Lun as a pseudonym, one has little doubt whose active brain supplied this piece of advertising.

From these records of its first season, it would appear that the Oratory proved a profitable undertaking, one which its proprietors were loath to give up. This impression is reinforced by its revival during following seasons; in the winter of 1752-53, it was begun early in December, the first performance taking place on Thursday the 7th, and was so frequently repeated that it was given for the twenty-third time on January 8, 1753. During this season, Mrs. Midnight was led to advertise for talent:

Any Person, of whatever Party, Persuasion, Countenance, or Country. Who is able to entertain the Publick, in a singular and agreeable Manner, may enter into present Pay and good Quarters, with Mrs. Midnight's Band of Originals, by applying to her, at the Theatre in the Haymarket, any Evening at 5 o'clock.*

Perhaps the "Oration on the Salt-Box, by a Rationalist," the "Dissertation on the Jew's Harp by a Casuist," the "Piece by Sig. Spoonatissimo, on an Instrument dug out of the Ruins of Herculeaneum, much used by the ancient Romans, and celebrated by Virgil in his Georgics," the "grand Dance in the ancient British Taste," and all that Timbertoe could do in the way of hornpipes were beginning to pall upon the

* London *Daily Advertiser*, December 27, 1752.

audience; or it may have been discovered thus early that amateurs afforded possibilities of profit for those who brought them before the public. At any rate, Mrs. Midnight advertised for new talent, and even went so far as to promise on December 13 that "after the above Performance (if agreeable to the good Company) will be exhibited Gratis a Pantomime Entertainment, by the Animal Comedians, brought from Italy by Signior Ballard."¹⁰ Apparently the audience demanded novelty, and Mrs. Midnight did her best to supply the demand. Equally apparent is the singularity of her methods of advertising, of which one suspects the following is an example:

THE young Lady who was in the Pit at the Old Woman's Oratory last Monday Night with an old Gentlewoman, and a genteel young Fellow dressed in a Barragon Coat, and red Cloth Waistcoat trimmed with Gold, who are thought to be her Mother and Brother, and were joined Company by three Ladies and a Gentleman before the Oratory began, is desired by a young Gentleman, whose Heart she has taken Possession of, whose Designs are honourable, and has a Fortune independant, capable of maintaining a Wife like a Gentlewoman, to advertise in this Paper, where he may have the Happiness of having an Interview with her.¹¹

Clearly, considering the frequency as well as the character of the performances, one can understand that Smart's connection with this entertainment, in whatever capacity, may have occupied a good bit of

¹⁰ Mr. Ainsworth kindly supplied me with material for this description of a cut in the Bodleian of "Mrs. Midnight's Animal Comedians." Several pictures of the performers are shown, together with this motto,

To you dear friends we hold th' instructive glass
That ye may see your Shadows as ye pass.

It is said to have been "Published according to an Act of Parliament 1753," and the following descriptions are given of the individual cuts "1 The Monkies Entertainment where One of the Same Specie acts the part of a waiter. 2 Two Dogs account'd like Soldiers which Shew their Activity by jumping over several Bundles of Sticks. 3 Three Dogs in the Characters of Harlequin, Pero, & Columbine. 4. The Besieging of a Town by the Dogs who are repuls'd by the Monkies within and several of y^e Dogs are thrown from the Battlements 5 a grand Ballott Dance by the Dogs and Monkies. 6. the Proprietor exercising two Monkies upon two Dogs like Men on Horseback. 7. A Dog who shams lame and performs several Tricks on the Cards. 8. One Dog standing Centry while another wheels a Barrow with great niceness close to the Edge of the Stage, avoiding with some Difficulty the Many Dangers of the Pit. 9. A Monkey managing a Dog with as much Art perhaps, as some People would a Horse likewise mounts and dismounts before the audience. 10. A Dog that goes up a Ladder backwards and afterwards walks round three Candles upon his fore Paws in the manner describ'd." Mr. Ainsworth remarks that Hill is shown in a box writing the *Inspector* for November 30

¹¹ *Public Advertiser*, December 15, 1752. About this time the Adventurer visited the performance and so commented upon it in his paper for January 9, 1753, as would probably increase the interest of the public. Hawkesworth appears always to have felt kindly toward Smart

his time and allowed him less for writing for immediate publication.⁷²

Aside from the occupation this venture afforded him, another possible explanation for the apparent lull in his activities lies in his publication, shortly before June, 1752, of *Poems on Several Occasions*. Even though this volume was projected perhaps as early as 1748 and certainly by 1750⁷³ and not a little of the material had already been printed, a good bit of time must have gone into preparing this volume for the press and securing the imposing list of subscribers, which occupies ten closely printed, double-column pages. Besides, with the money so obtained, Smart was doubtless able to live for a time without the frantic activity which characterized his earlier days in London.

This volume supplies us with two interesting bits of information. In the first place, the number of subscribers shows that he had already achieved a fairly wide reputation as well as that he had succeeded in interesting a large group of people in his welfare. Furthermore, the contents hint that somewhat before the middle of 1752 he had begun to pay his court to Anna Maria Carnan, Newbery's stepdaughter, whom he was later to marry. At least, "The Lass with the Golden Locks," said by Seccombe to have been addressed to her, was there printed.

When or how his quarrel with Hill originated is uncertain. Nor in all probability were the causes entirely literary. The two men spent much of their time in about the same places and knew many of the same people; in addition, they were in some respects rivals and may have met rather frequently. Under these circumstances, personal antipathies sometimes develop rapidly, and something of the sort may account for a considerable part of the friction between them, as Smart seems to have been unduly sensitive at times and Hill to have aroused an active dislike in more than one of his contemporaries. But the existence of such antipathy is purely conjectural, and at present the quarrel can be traced only in its literary aspects. Perhaps Hill's first notice of Smart came in the sixth paper of the *Inspector* (March 9, 1751), where he remarked concerning the performance of *Othello*, for which Smart supplied prologue and epilogue:

Mr J D---- spoke an excellent prologue, and this lady an epilogue, hardly at all inferior to it; the least we can say in regard to this part of the performance, is, that they both deserved all the applause they received on their delivering them⁷⁴

⁷² Mr Ainsworth reminds me that not a few of the pieces used in these entertainments appeared in subsequent issues of the *Midwife*.

⁷³ See pp. 5, 8, *ante*

⁷⁴ Quoted from the *Hilliad*, p. 6.

In the following December Mrs. Midnight treats the Inspector in no very flattering fashion in the *Midwife*¹⁵; her motive is not apparent. It would seem that the next hostile act was Hill's comment on a passage in *On the Immensity of the Supreme Being*. In the *Inspector*¹⁶ he remarks:

We find Mr Smart, a Person of real and of great Genius, in a late Poem on one of the Attributes of the supreme Being, in the Midst of Passages that would have done Honour to many an Antient, talking of *Shrubs of Amber*, as if that mineral Substance had been a Plant growing at the Bottom of the Sea

Considered alone, this remark should have caused little resentment on Smart's part, especially inasmuch as Hill gave examples of the same sort of error from Pope, Shakespeare, Milton, and Gray and then continued, "They are Examples, the more striking as the Authors in which they occur are great" Probably whatever sting there was in this comment came from Hill's tone of superiority and from his having elected to include Smart in his list of those guilty of this particular literary sin; Smart's reputation was certainly not great enough nor that one error flagrant enough to make his slip from grace a very striking illustration. To Smart it may have looked like gratuitous picking of flaws.

Whatever may then have been Smart's attitude, he had every reason to be indignant at the next attack. Hill's war with Fielding was then at its height, and on August 13, 1752, he brought out anonymously the single number of the *Impertinent*, chiefly it would appear for the purpose of attacking Smart and Fielding. In part it reads:

There are men who write because they have wit, there are those who write because they are hungry. There are some of the modern authors who have a constant fund of both these causes. The first are all spirit, the second are all earth, the third disclose more life, or more vapidity, as the one or the other cause prevails.

Of the first one sees an instance in Fielding, Smart with equal right stands foremost among the second, of the third the mingled wreath belongs to Hill.

Those of the first rank are the most capricious, and the most lazy of all animals. The monkey genius would rarely exert itself, if even idleness innate did not give way to the superior love of mischief. The ass that characterizes the second is as laborious, and as dull, and as indefatigable as he is empty. Stranger to the caprice of genius, he knows none of its risings or its fall, but he wears a ridiculous comicalness of aspect, that makes people smile when they see him at a distance. His mouth opens, because he must be fed; and the world

¹⁵ *Midwife* III, 83 ff.

¹⁶ Number 350, *London Daily Advertiser*, April 14, 1752.

often joins with the philosopher in laughing at the insensibility and obstinacy that make him prick his lips with thistles."¹⁷

Hill's allusions to himself make it clear that he hoped his authorship of the *Impertinent* to escape detection.

During the same month came Hill's review of the *Poems on Several Occasions*.¹⁸ Of complimentary generalities he gives Smart more than enough, but his remarks on specific points are usually censorious. His comments on the "Epithalamium" are distinctly unkind; yet it must be admitted that his quotations justify his censures. Perhaps his criticism of *The Hop Garden* is harshest, but even there one feels that his discussion of the requirements of blank verse gives authority to his adverse criticisms of the piece. A casual reader would judge Hill an impartial critic when he reproves Smart for writing below his genius through want of care—a critic who, though he wrote rather bluntly and positively, did Smart more honor perhaps than he deserved when he compared his abilities favorably with those displayed by Gray in the *Elegy* and concluded:

Enough will be seen in these and the other specimens selected from the more finished of these pieces, to justify us in giving Mr Smart a place among the first of the present race of *English* poets. If the censures, which it is the character of this work to bestow as freely as its praises, shall warn him to be more attentive to the finishing his works for the future, there is no doubt of his becoming equal to most who have done honour to the last or the preceding age.

But Smart was doubtless not a casual reader. When he learned of Hill's perpetration of the *Impertinent*, the appearance of impartiality in this review must have struck him as only a device to render the disparagement more effective.

Nor would he be likely to feel more kindly toward his adversary when he read in the *Inspector* for August 25:

Not to affect a Triumph, in which I might seem personally concerned, and which would carry an Appearance of betraying a better Opinion of these Papers than I really entertain of them; not to mention the cold Reception and the consequent short Lives of the several periodical Pieces set up in vain, or revived as vainly during the last eighteen Months, I shall only produce a very late one, the most pert, the most pretending, and the most short-liv'd of them all. I have sent in vain to Mr Bouquet for the second Number of the *Impertinent*. . . It will be in vain to accuse the Town of patronizing Dulness, or encouraging Ill-nature, while we can produce this Instance, in which a Load of personal Satire, and that of the most unguarded Kind, exhibited at the Price of Two-pence, could

¹⁷ Quoted from the *Hillsiad*, p. 3.

¹⁸ *The Monthly Review*, VII (1752), 131-43.

not procure Purchasers enough to promote a second Number. It will not be easy to say too much in favour of that Candour, which has rejected and despised a Piece that cruelly and unjustly attacked Mr. *Smart*, that mischievously and unfairly censured Mr. *Fielding*, to whom it allowed the greatest Merit; that wantonly mangled the Inspector; and that treated the Character of Sir *William Brown*, in a Manner hardly precedented: The last Author I believe but of one Piece, and that not likely ever to have been heard of but by this Accident.

It is understandable if Smart considered this a cowardly attempt of Hill's to protect his own reputation by concealing his authorship of the *Impertinent* and at the same time to give still wider publicity to his attack. He may be pardoned for remembering Pope's example and setting about the composition of a mock-epic as a pillory for his enemy.

Nor were Smart's friends silent. For example, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for August, 1752, Johnson quotes the Inspector's denunciation of the *Impertinent* and remarks:

This character of the *Impertinent*, and account of its reception, however quaint, and inaccurate the expressions, as they are indisputably just, might be thought a sufficient gratification of publick curiosity; but there is yet an interesting anecdote behind with which "the world has a right to be acquainted"—The man who thus resents the cruel treatment of Mr. Smart in the Inspector, and he who thus cruelly treated him in the *Impertinent*, is known to be the same. The worthy and ingenious Dr. Hill, who every day obliges the world with a moral, or a philosophical essay; and on Saturday with a lecture on religion, is the scribler who publish'd the *load* of *personal abuse*, that excited the indignation of the public, and produced the most *pert*, *assuming*, and *short lived* of all the periodical pieces which have lately appeared; and in this abuse and pertness, he would probably have persisted till the work had swell'd to a volume; but that the contempt, and indignation with which his attempt was treated, discourag'd him from risking the necessary expence of paper and printing, and induced him to join in the publick censure, as a detected felon, when he is persued, cries out stop thief, and hopes to escape in the croud that follows him."

Arthur Murphy is less restrained when in the *Gray's Inn Journal* of November 11 he comments that Hill, "not having due Regard to Decency, hath presumed to rail with all the Vehemence of a Billingsgate Orator, against Mr. Christopher Smart."⁸⁰

So apparently matters rested for a time; but when the *Inspector* of December 6, 1752, appeared, it was mock *mea culpa* to Fielding and several others acknowledging the gravity of his sins against them and the justice of their attacks upon him. It seems to have been stimulated

⁸⁰ P. 387.

⁸¹ Jensen, *op cit*, I, 81.

by Hill's having learned of the existence of Smart's *Hilliad*. Most interesting is this section:

There is one *Smart* also, against whose Severity I have still less to plead: It was I that introduced him to the World His Bookseller took him into Salary, on my Approbation of the Specimens which he offered. I betrayed him into the Profession; and having starved upon it, he has Right to abuse me. I am afraid I have since been guilty of saying that he had Genius. Has he not reason to make me the hero of a Dunciad?

This was followed the next day by an *Inspector* of which Smart is the chief subject.

I have observed, in Vindication of those who treated Writers with Neglect, that they are in general Men who have neither Gratitude nor Honour

I laugh'd when I included Woodward and Kennedy among the Number Whatever Claim the Morals of these People may have to the Title, 'tis Raillery to speak of them as if they had any other The naming *Fielding* I am afraid was cruel: But there is yet one, that *Smart*, mentioned in the same place, whom altho' against the universal Determination, I must continue of Opinion to have, or if not that, once to have had something like Qualifications of the Head, and whose Qualities of Heart will amply make good the full Severity of that Assertion. The general Clamour will demand some example of the Truth; and it is fortunate that I can produce a living and an acting Instance. 'Tis yet more fortunate, that this opportunity offers in the Person of one, whose Ingratitude toward myself, altho' it could not provoke my resentment, justifies the Freedom

I have mentioned that I was the Cause of this Person's being brought up to London I have been at all Times since his Friend, and, so far as what little Weight I had with the World would go, have supported his Character Long before I appeared as Inspector, I spoke well of those Pieces, on the Merit of which his fortune at that Time depended The Bookseller who apply'd to me was *Newberry*, and he has supported him, if not at a great Expence, at least as well as he deserv'd ever since I in all Places have been his Champion against the Severity of his Readers If nothing appeared in the Piece, at least I pointed out a Promise of something that would appear When it was no longer possible to speak favourably of him as a Prose Writer, I declar'd there was Merit in his Verse, and when beaten out of that Hold, I still asserted his Latin Pieces were harmonious, and at last when *Bourne* and others were brought as Rivals in this, I only gave him up in Silence

When the *Midwife* died, and from Author he commenced Orator; when he produced, under the Name of the Old Woman's Oratory, what all have declared the meanest, the most absurd, and most contemptible of all Performances that have disgraced a Theatre, I never would be induced to see it, that my Voice might not injure him And very lately, when he had got into the Direction of a Company of *Dogs and Monkeys*, I (altho' from the accounts I have since received I heartily beg Pardon of the Publick for it) spoke of them as capable to afford entertainment In Justice to myself, I am to add, that if Accounts I had received of them under the most solemn Asseverations had been true, they

would have deserved all that I said in their Favour As it was not; he, who in deceiving me deceived the Publick, must take the Contempt and the Resentment of that Publick for his Pains

The Purpose of this Paper is to point out the Gratitude and Honour of an Author: And I have selected this Person's Conduct as an Instance of it It would appear from so much of his History as is past, that I have been in an uncommon Manner his Friend, that had deserved of him all that one Writer could deserve of another What has been the Return? The Man was too much below the Rank of an Acquaintance to give me Opportunities of receiving his immediate Protestations, but I have had them from his Friends, and, though I blush to confess so much, I have believed them The real Return that he has made me is an abusive Poem, which he has read at Alehouses and Cyder Cellars, and if any Bookseller will run the Risque, will publish Nor should I have mentioned this, was not one of the most amiable Characters in the World, that of a Person, an entire Stranger to the Author, and who cannot have been guilty even of obliging him, treated in it with the same Scurrility

If any shall suppose Severity and Reproof to be the Intent of this Paper, they misunderstand me greatly The Object is beneath such Notice I had lain down a general Assertion which bore hard upon the Fraternity of Authors; and it was expected that I should make it good I could not produce a stronger Instance, nor could any other be so proper Since all that concerned this had fallen within my immediate Knowledge Objects that are too low for Resentment may be used as general Admonition And what might be censured as cruel, if urged against the Innocent, will pass freely when it is protected by Justice

Satire, unless very delicately conveyed, wounds the Ear of Candour; and even in its best Habit, it does not please as Satire, but for the Sake of that Wit and Elegance which attend it Those who have Talents for no other Species of Writing, usually fall on this; but they may be assured they have no Talents at all I have always avoided, and always shall avoid wanton Cruelty, and notwithstanding that I have thought it necessary to hang this Offender in Chains, by way of Scare-Crow to the little Criminals that have their Eye upon him; I am far from placing any Merit to the Account I imagine that few Papers I have written, will give less Pleasure than the present, and this, not only because the Subject is unworthy Notice, but because there is in it severe, tho' it be just, Censure If I had not thought the Lightness of yesterday's Irony, too gentle a Rebuke for the Vices which were its Subject, I should not have done Violence to myself in executing it He who suffers the Punishment, will hardly feel more than I do when I inflict it

Reply came promptly and perhaps from a source unexpected to Hull. It would appear that this advertisement was given rather wide publicity:

Whereas the Inspector in his paper of the 7th instant, has confidently asserted, that he recommended Mr Smart to me, and made us acquainted; I think it my duty to undeceive the publick, and contradict an assertion so absolutely false

The truth is—Dr. Hill (the supposed author of the *Inspector*) called at my house one Sunday in the afternoon, about six months after Mr. Smart and I had been concerned together in business, and expressed a desire of being made known to him. As Mr. Smart was then above stairs, I brought them together, when the doctor complimented him on his writings, and gave both him and me an invitation to his house, which was never complied with. By the manner of their addressing each other they appeared to be absolute strangers and after the doctor was gone, Mr. Smart told me he had never seen Dr. Hill before.

I farther declare, that to the best of my knowledge and belief, Mr. Smart never wrote any thing for hire, nor did he ever sell me any copy of his that I have published.

St. Paul's Church-Yard,
December 9, 1752.

JOHN NEWBERY."

A more circumstantial denial of Hill's charges it would be difficult to frame; and less than a week later Smart added his testimony:

Whereas Dr. HILL, in the *Inspector* of the 7th Instant, charges me with Ingratitude to him the said Hill; I solemnly declare, that I never received the least favour from him, directly or indirectly, unless an Invitation to Dinner, which I never accepted of, may be reckon'd such. On the contrary, he has ever been (as far as is in the Power of such a Fellow) my Enemy; among many Instances, of which I shall only mention one, viz. a Paper called the IMPERTINENT (written by him without any Provocation from me) in which not only myself, but a particular Friend of mine was scurrilously treated. Notwithstanding all this I should still have persisted thinking an *illiterate Hireling* below my Regard, had he not published in his Papers of the 6th and 7th Inst. a Collection of such gross Falsehoods couch'd in such Billingsgate Language, as is not (I believe) to be met with in any other Writer. I am therefore determined to follow the Advice of my Friends, and bring the *egregious Coxcomb* to poetical Justice, in the *Hilliad*, the first Book of which will be published with all possible Despatch

CHRISTOPHER SMART"

On the 19th, the same notice is repeated with this addition:

'Tis altogether incredible, that Mr. Newbery should apply to Hill for his Opinion of any Poetical Performance, for every Man who is acquainted with Mr. Newbery's Abilities must allow that he is a much better Judge of Polite Writings than Dr. Hill.

According to the summary of the quarrel in the "Supplement" to the *Gentleman's Magazine*,²⁵ "After this came out *Codghil & Mango*," a six-penny pamphlet, which was listed in the December issue under the

²⁵ Quoted from the *Hilliad*, p. 7 Also reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1752 (p. 600).

²⁶ *Public Advertiser*, December 14, 1752. McKenzie quotes (*op. cit.*, p. 28) a slightly different version of this advertisement, taken, it would appear, from the *Daily Advertiser*

²⁷ XXII (1752), 600.

title *An essay on the rationality of brutes*.⁶⁴ The review article in that number of the magazine continues thus:

With a philosophical comparison between Dr *Codgill*, inspector general of *Town-Island*, and *Mango*, the great monkey, director general of the animal performers in the *Haymarket*. . . After making many quotations from Father *Bougeant* and other authors, with a kind of ludicrous gravity; examples are given of the sagacity of *Mango*, and a parallel is drawn between him and Dr *Codgill*, in which *Mango* appears to great advantage, with respect both to his natural and moral character; the piece concludes with the following queries

— Whose money did *Mango* ever receive and convert to his own use? Whose property did he ever invade, and set the owner at defiance? Whose profession did he ever wantonly and wickedly debase, and expose to public ridicule and scorn? Whose character and credit did he ever endeavour to blast? Who can accuse him of betraying private trust, or despising public censure? Did ever *Mango* say and unsay, deny this to-day that he advanced yesterday; huff, bounce, cringe and cajole, all with one and the same breath? If nothing of this kind can be alleged against the animal, then his moral character must stand confess'd.— But will the doctor's boasted life stand the severity of this test!—Did he never slander, traduce, stir up contention, propagate falsities, lye, defame, cheat, forswear, delude, abandon, debauch, convert the property of another to his own use, blast an innocent character, debase a reputable profession, say and unsay, advance and deny, huff, bounce, cringe and cajole, all with the same breath? When this spotless doctor has answer'd all these in the negative, then let the public judge, which soul is in the best situation, the soul of the man in the brute body, or the soul of the brute in the man's body? or, to make short the question, the soul of *Mango*, or the soul of Dr *Codgill*?

No hint is given of the authorship of this piece.

In the meantime, Hill replied to Newbery's denial by an attack on him in the *Inspector* for December 12, which contained this sentence: The assertion of such a man as *Newbery* would be no more regarded than the oath of *Woodward*, I am ashamed of ever having taken notice of what people of this stamp say—I shall do it no more—When I name them 'tis not to dispute with them, but to chastise them.⁶⁵

The contents of the almost immediate replies reveal more of Hill's specific charges. In the *Public Advertiser* for December 15 four of Newbery's friends—Stephen Janssen, Alderman; Thomas Brewer, Stationer; Samuel Birt, Bookseller; and William Strahan, Printer—vouched for Newbery's character, which had been "maliciously aspersed" by Dr. Hill because he had "no other Method of evading

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 587. I have found no copy of this piece, which apparently served both as an attack on Hill and an advertisement of the Old Woman's Oratory. It was published by Bouquet, the printer of the *Impertinent*.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 601.

the Truth of those Facts, which Justice to Mr. Smart obliged Mr. Newbery to make public." On the following day, and on the 18th, a more detailed refutation of Hill's slander appeared:

A Report having been artfully propagated to the Disadvantage of Mr John Newbery in St. Paul's Church-yard, intimating that the said Mr Newbery had fail'd and compounded with his Creditors, makes it incumbent on us to stand forth in Behalf of a Man so much injur'd, and to set that matter in a clear Light.

During the last Rebellion some Enemy to Mr Newbery insinuated to several of his Creditors, that he had lost two Thousand Pounds in the North of England and Scotland, in consequence of which many of them brought in their Accounts, and press'd him for Payment. As it was impossible for him immediately to satisfy all their Demands, he was obliged to solicit them for Time to collect in his Debts Upon this they express'd much concern, and offer'd to accept of a Composition of Ten Shillings in the Pound, to which he made answer, that it would give him great uneasiness if any Man should lose Ten Shillings by him while he was able to pay Twenty, and inform'd them that he had Goods and Debts sufficient to pay double their Demands He thereupon set about collecting his Money, and paying his Creditors, and, when a Jealousy arose about some People's being paid before others, Mr Newbery took a Warehouse at his own Expence, into which he put a large Quantity of Goods and assign'd them over to us in Trust, for the further Security of his Creditors. After this the said John Newbery paid every Body Twenty Shillings in the Pound, and Interest likewise to them that would accept of it.—As the said Mr Newbery was then indebted almost Three Thousand Pounds, and by such Composition could have saved to himself so considerable a Sum as FIFTEEN HUNDRED POUNDS, we imagine that this will be consider'd as a singular Instance of Probity by all the World, and it happening to fall under our *immediate Knowledge*, we cannot help looking upon him as a Man of great Honour and Integrity, and expressing our concern that so worthy a Character should be so wantonly traduced

London, Dec 15,
1752

Thomas Brewer, *Ludgate-Street*,
Samuel Birt, *Ave-mary-lane*,
William Strahan, *New-Street*

Here the matter rested until the following January, when the *Hullhad* made its appearance in all the panoply of prolegomena and *notes variorum*. In the introductory material, after the letters exchanged between Smart and a Cambridge friend concerning the advisability of publishing the *Hullhad*, and combining thorough abuse of Hill with high praise of Fielding,⁸⁸ are, first of all, extracts from the *Impertinent* and the *Gentleman's Magazine* and then "AN Accurate and Impartial STATE OF THE ACCOUNT BETWEEN Mr. SMART and Dr. HILL." This was divided into two sections: "Mr. SMART

⁸⁸ For these, see Chalmers

Debtor to Dr. HILL, For his PRAISES," on the even-numbered pages, and opposite "PER CONTRA Creditor, For his ABUSE." Here were presented allusions to and quotations from several *Inspector* papers, the *Impertinent*, and the *Monthly Review* and finally this conclusion¹⁷:

Due on the BALANCE to the INSPECTOR,

THE HILLIAD,

An Heroic POEM

Bedford Coffee-House, Jan 16, 1753

RECEIVED then of one SMART, the first book of the HILLIAD, in part of payment, for the many and great obligations he is under to me.

Witness {	{ QUINBUS FLESTRIN,	his
		The + INSPECTOR
	{ GABRIEL GRIFFIN	mark

Not until the very end did Martinus Macularius, one of the learned commentators, point out an "ERRATUM Magnum Lacrimabile":

He [the author] has made himself debtor to Dr Hill for his praises, and creditor for his abuse; whereas in truth and nature the reverse must be right, viz. The Doctor's abuse is an obligation, and his praise is downright Billingsgate. Swift says, —

On me when blockheads are satyric,
I take it for a panegyric

And again,

When scoundrels give me the dominion,
They damn me in my own opinion¹⁸

The poem itself was introduced by this protestation of the purity of Smart's motives:

Notwithstanding the great incentives he has had to prompt him to this undertaking, he is not actuated by the spirit of revenge, and to check the sallies of fancy and humourous invention, he further invokes the goddess Themis, to administer strict, poetic justice¹⁹

Of course, Smart followed the example of the *Dunciad* not only in the technique of the mock epic but also in the practice of sparing no pains to render his hero as uncomfortable as possible. Aside from a few stabs aimed at Henley, practically every line of the poem was concentrated on Hill—his character, his widely varied occupations, and the dullness of his compositions. Probably Smart hungered even less for "strict, poetic justice" than did his greater predecessor. Nevertheless,

¹⁷ P. 18 of the 1753 edition Quinbus Flestrin is from *Gulliver's Travels*

¹⁸ P. 46

¹⁹ P. 19.

or perhaps therefore, most readers will agree that the *Hilliad* is, as a whole, a fairly amusing piece of ephemera, on which Smart seems to have lavished more care than on many of his more serious works. Surely it deserves more honor than is accorded it by Thomas Seccombe, who says that it "is only memorable as having suggested the form of the 'Rolliad.'"

As in the *Dunciad*, some of the most discomforting shafts of satire are reserved for the notes with which the text was elaborately supplied; this paraphrase of Dryden's epigram on Milton is typical:

Three great wise men in the same Æra born,
 Britannia's happy island did adorn.
 Henley in care of souls display'd his skill,
 Rock shone in physick, and in both John H--ll,
 The force of nature could no farther go,
 To make a third, she join'd the former two."¹

It would be illuminating could we know when Smart began the poem, for then we could judge what provocation was necessary to set him thus to work to secure so elaborate a revenge on his enemy. Pertinent also would be the knowledge of whether his *Old Woman's Dunciad*, the publication of which was forestalled by Kenrick, supplied any of the material used against Hill. Knowing so little as we do, it seems safe, however, to acquit him of any unnatural vindictiveness; for certainly between the middle of August, when among other less violent attacks the *Impertinent* appeared, and early December, when Hill indicates that the *Hilliad* was complete, there was ample time for him to have written the reply, especially if he availed himself somewhat of his earlier attempt in the field of the mock epic.²

¹ P. 39 f. The Rock mentioned here was a quack who, at this time, was advertising widely his Viper Drops and the Purging Antivenereal Electuary. The former "restore greatly in weak Habits; strengthen weak Backs; warm and invigorate Parts that are languid and weakened by Gleet, or other Injuries; they help Digestion, comfort a cold Stomach, and expel Wind both from thence and the Bowels, and help the Effects of hard Drinking; cleanse the Ureters from slimy or fabulous Matter, thereby taking away Gravel Palms in the Back, compose hurried Spirits, and take off Flutterings and Lowness, comforting the Brain, and causing Cheerfulness: They are a noble Balsamick also for all inward and outward Wounds, consolidating the Part injured, almost instantly; cure Burns or Scaldings, applied immediately, in a surprising Manner and without leaving disagreeable Marks or Eschars." (London *Daily Advertiser*, July 17, 1752.) McKenzie (*op cit*, p. 29) cites a statement that Arthur Murphy wrote the notes for the *Hilliad*.

² The *Smertiad*, which very soon followed the *Hilliad*, adds nothing to our knowledge of Smart, Hill, and their quarrel. I am unaware upon what evidence the piece is assigned to Hill by Seccombe in the article on Smart in the *Dictionary*

The advertisement of Smart's other published works with which the *Hilliad* volume closed provides a convenient occasion for surveying some of his other activities during the preceding months. Besides the second edition of Pope's "Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day" and his *Poems on Several Occasions*, which have already been mentioned, there are listed second editions of *On the Eternity of the Supreme Being* and *On the Immensity of the Supreme Being*, as well as the first edition of his Seatonian prize poem for 1752, *On the Omniscience of the Supreme Being*. This latter was certified as the prize-winning piece by the committee on November 2, 1752, and published with a dedication to the Archbishop of Canterbury in time to be announced in the December issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. As the list of Smart's works printed on the last page shows *On the Eternity* to be already in its second edition but *On the Immensity* to be still in its first, we are sure that the four pieces were published in the following order: the second edition of *On the Eternity* (between the middle of 1750 and December, 1752), next the first edition of *On the Omniscience* (December), then the second of *On the Immensity* (late December or early January), and finally the *Hilliad* (January). Considering that the winter of 1752-53 was also a time when the Old Woman's Oratory was being regularly presented, one may judge that Smart was no more idle during this season than was usual.

It may be suggested that his marriage with Anna Maria Carnan also came at about this time, perhaps in the early months of 1753. Though certain evidence of the date is not now available, this view seems a reasonable one, inasmuch as when, on November 27, 1753, his marriage was discovered by the college authorities, they stated that he had then been married for some time.²² In addition, it may be urged that he seems to have been addressing verse to her before the middle of 1752. This change in status, whenever it occurred, may be taken as an indication that he was then progressing satisfactorily toward financial stability, if he had not already attained it, and that the future looked bright.

of *National Biography*; the contents indicate that someone else, who prefers anonymity, is the author.

Besides the *Pasquinade*, McKenzie (*op cit*, p 29) mentions another echo of this quarrel "The Geese strip of their quills or, proposals for depulping and rustivating the rival literati, etc., dont le dessein était 'de réprimander l'Inspecteur et M. S...t pour ces traits de médisance, ces lourds sarcasmes, ces injures indécentes, avec lesquels ils se sont dernièrement accablés, et pour lesquels ils méritent (de l'avis de notre auteur), d'être expulsés de la république des lettres.'" ²² Gosse, *op. cit*, 366.

Otherwise, Smart, knowing that the discovery of his marriage would mean the loss of his fellowship, would have been behaving with more than usual imprudence in assuming the responsibility of a family; furthermore, it is unlikely that Newbery, sound business man that he appears to have been, would have sanctioned this step and have accepted Smart as a son-in-law (as their continued business association seems to show that he did) unless he felt that Smart might look forward to a moderately prosperous future.

Here, too, it is pertinent to comment upon the late Sir Edmund Gosse's widely accepted notion that Smart suffered his first attack of insanity late in 1751.⁹³ D. C. Tovey showed that Gosse misinterpreted the passage in Gray's letters upon which his belief was principally founded and also pointed out that it was unlikely that Newbery would have allowed the marriage of his stepdaughter to a man who was known recently to have been confined in an insane asylum.⁹⁴ To these arguments it may be added that the foregoing survey of Smart's activities shows that he had scarcely time to be insane. Until the beginning of 1752 his work for the *Midwife*, and during part of that time for the *Student*, was uninterrupted; furthermore, Hill's silence on the subject is most difficult to explain if before 1753 his enemy had suffered even a short confinement in Bedlam. During 1753 his continued productiveness supports the conviction of his continued mental health.

In that year, aside from those already mentioned—the *Hilliad* and the second edition of *On the Immensity of the Supreme Being*—his publications included a Dublin edition of the *Hilliad*, with which he doubtless had no connection; possibly *Mother Midnight's Comical Pocketbook*, the publication of which by Dowse is announced in the December issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*,⁹⁵ and the third volume of the collected edition of the *Midwife*. In view of its not having been published by Newbery or Carnan, it is doubtful that Smart had any connection with the *Comical Pocketbook*. Examination of the contents of the third volume of the *Midwife* proves that some work was done in preparing it for the press, for it includes material which can definitely be dated as later than the last issue of the magazine. A paper from the *Craftsman* bearing the date March 31, 1753, and the "Prologue intended to have been spoken by Mr. Woodward at his benefit, in the character

⁹³ Edmund Gosse, "Smart's Poems," *Gossip in a Library* (New York, 1891), pp. 189 f.

⁹⁴ *Notes and Queries*, Series X, Vol. III, pp. 221 f., 354.

⁹⁵ Noticed in the *Monthly Review* for January, 1754.

of the Old Mock Doctor, to introduce the new one" are obviously additions or substitutions; so, too, in all probability are several other pieces, for example, "*To my worthy Friend, Mr. T. B. one of the People called Quakers, written in his Garden, July 1752.*"⁸⁸ Finally, the composition of *On the Power of the Supreme Being* occupied some of his time during this year; it was awarded the Seatonian prize on December 5, 1753, and announced among the new books in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1754, with the comment that "The usual prize was adjudged to Mr Smart, for this poem, of which we cannot deny our readers the following specimen, tho' it may encrease their desire to see the whole."

In 1754 a comparable amount of work appeared. A Dublin edition of the *Index of Mankind* was brought out by James Hoey, who pirated not a few London publications; and "Mrs *Midnight's* works compleat," perhaps a reissue of the complete *Midwife*, is listed as being circulated by Newbery in the March number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. In addition, there is the possibility that he took part in the pamphlet war raging about the Elizabeth Canning case. The leader of the Canningites was Fielding, and the head of the other party Hill. One of the cloud of broadsheets, "His Fib and Sophistry destroy'd in vain, The Creatures at his dirty work again," mentions Smart, alludes to Hill's *Impertinent*, and attacks Hill vigorously⁸⁹; it is certainly open to question that Smart was the author, but it is equally certain that he would have welcomed the chance to ally himself with Fielding against Hill and that this was the sort of subject to which he would have enjoyed turning his facile pen.

During this year, too, came his first continued connection with the *Gentleman's Magazine*. While it was under Cave's editorship, he had contributed only occasionally to its selection of "Poetical Essays"—"Care and Generosity," for example, was printed there in October, 1751—but immediately upon the death of Cave, he became one of the main supports of that department. In fact, the February issue, which contains Johnson's "Account of the Life of the late Mr Edward Cave," has "On my Wife's Birth Day," signed H[erbert?] T[rueman?] and

⁸⁸ III, 136 ff., 145, 149 f. The benefit referred to is apparently the performance of the *Alchemist* and the *Mock Doctor* on March 20, 1753. Hill's *Inspector* of December 6, 1752, makes it clear that the *Midwife* had already ceased publication a considerable time before that date (See p. 32, *ante*).

⁸⁹ I have not seen this broadsheet, a copy of which was offered for sale by Pickering and Chatto, Catalogue 308.

addressed to Nancy, and "The Brocaded Gown and Linen Rag," signed "C. Smart"; and during the rest of the year his contributions were numerous. Among the pieces printed there, and elsewhere published as his, are "Ode, To a Virginia Nightingale," signed Herbert Trueman; "On a Lady throwing Snow-balls at her Lover," signed Z. A.; "Fanny Blooming Fair. Translated into Latin; in the manner of Mr Bourne," signed "C. S. Ætat. 16"; "To Miss S---- P---e," sent by "J. K." from Reading; "Jenny Grey," without signature; "The Widow's Resolution," said to be "By Mr Lun"; "An Invitation to Mrs T-----, a Clergyman's Lady, to dine upon a Couple of Ducks on the Anniversary of the Author's Wedding Day. By Mr S-----t"; "The Duellists," signed "C. S."; "The Long-nosed Fair"; "Fashion and Night," unsigned; "The Silent Fair," set to music; "The Goose, the Snake, and the Nightingale"; and the "Ode to Lord Barnard, on his Accession to that Title," the copy of which, it would seem from the prefatory note, was supplied by someone other than Smart.⁹⁹ Not only do these contributions provide interesting clues as to his activities at this time, but the texts here printed supply some important variants from the more familiar versions of Chalmers and others.

In original work the following year, 1755, is more barren. *On the Goodness of the Supreme Being*, his last Seatonian poem, was granted the prize on October 28; it is said¹⁰⁰ to have arrived at Cambridge almost too late for consideration. Aside from that there are only contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, among them: "Mrs Abigail and the Dumb Waiter"; "Lady Harriote," signed "C. S."; "The Country 'Squire, and the Mandrake," signed "C. S."; and the epilogue "Whoe'er begot thee had no cause to blush," signed "C. Smart, M. A."¹⁰⁰ The appearance, in December or January, ¹⁰¹ of his translation of Horace into English prose supplies some explanation, however, of

⁹⁹ There is some reason to believe that the following are also by Smart: a translation of "The famous Epigram of Sannazarius on Venice," signed "Z. A."; two translations of "An Epitaph found about 30 years since in the Church of St Botolph, Bishopsgate, London," signed "Z. A."; "The Bargain Refused," which is later set to music; "To Miss H[arriot Pratt?], with some Musick; written by a Poet outrageously in love," signed "S."; and three epigrams which are grouped with "The Long-nosed Fair."

¹⁰⁰ *Poems* (1791), p. xvi

¹⁰¹ Probably the "Epitaph on Mrs Rolt," signed "S" (p. 278) is also by Smart; Richard Rolt's first wife died February 22, 1755, we learn from the *Universal Visitor* (p. 192).

¹⁰² The title-page bears the date 1756; yet it is mentioned as one of the new publications in the December, 1755, issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Chalmers (*op. cit.*, XVI, 10) gives the date as 1757

the paucity of original work during 1755, and perhaps for some time previous; for the work of the translation could not but have required months and may perhaps have stretched back into 1754. Furthermore, it is pertinent that, in his dedication of the *Hymn to the Supreme Being, on Recovery from a Dangerous Fit of Illness* (February, 1756) to Dr. James, Smart remarked that this was the third time "that your judgment and medicines rescued me from the grave, permit me to say, in a manner almost miraculous." To judge from the record of his work thus far presented, there was not time previous to 1753 during which a protracted illness could have occurred. Physical incapacity may well be the reason for his failure to win the Seatonian prize in 1754, inasmuch as he seems only to have had to compete in order to win. At least, when G. Bally's prize-winning *On the Justice of the Supreme Being* was announced as recently published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February, 1755, it is carefully explained that "this prize has for many years been constantly assigned to the ingenious Mr. Christopher Smart, who was not this year among the competitors." Two or three serious illnesses (if his tribute to Dr. James' skill is more than an example of Newbery's ingenious advertising methods), the translation of a complete Horace, and other miscellaneous work would seem to fill the years 1754 and 1755 sufficiently.

Bad though his health may previously have been, it is clear that, at the end of 1755, Smart had no idea that he was shortly to be made unfit for sustained work for several years; for appended to his translation of Horace is the announcement

In the Press, and speedily will be published, (In One Octavo Volume) *Tales and Fables in Verse*. Adapted to People of all Ranks, and adorned with Cuts, designed and engraved by the best Masters By C Smart, A. M. Of Pembroke-College, Cambridge.²⁰⁰

Moreover, on November 11, 1755, he and Richard Rolt had entered into contract with Gardner and Allen to produce the *Universal Visiter* for as long as the venture proved profitable. On February 2, the first number appeared, and on March 1 the second. Furthermore, between these two issues came the first edition of *On the Goodness of the Supreme Being*, dedicated to the Earl of Darlington; and after the first of March in rapid succession, a third edition of *On the Eternity*, a second

²⁰⁰ A similar notice appears as late as March, 1756, at the end of the second editions of *On the Omniscience* and *On the Goodness*. Even so late as that, Smart, or his publishers, seems to have had little idea of what the next few years held for him.

of *On the Omniscience*, the first of the *Hymn to the Supreme Being*, and finally the second of *On the Goodness of the Supreme Being*.¹⁰² But, as is generally known, it was during this time that signs of Smart's madness appeared and that at last he became incapable of any sustained literary effort for years to come. As has already been told in some detail elsewhere,¹⁰⁴ his part in the *Universal Visitor* became smaller and smaller, and we hear little more of him until about the beginning of 1763.¹⁰⁵

When his madness came first upon him, Johnson, Garrick, and others of his friends and acquaintances came to his aid for a time in an effort to secure for him and for his family Smart's share of the profits. The willingness of so many to aid him speaks well for his faculty for creating friends among those with whom he was associated. Not improbably the burst of publications and reprintings described above was one of Newbery's methods of helping him and his family, now including his wife and two daughters, during this time of distress. *The Nonpareil*, a compilation of pieces from the *Midwife* is another example; it was combined with a new edition of the *Index of Mankind* and offered for sale by Carnan and Newbery, in 1757, probably in August. Nor did this exhaust Newbery's kindness; in 1757 he brought out a third edition of *On the Immensity* and in 1758 a second of *On the Power* and is said¹⁰⁶ to have set aside the profits of Goldsmith's *Martial Review* for the benefit of Smart. Goldsmith, too, evidently a favorite friend of the whole family, made independent efforts in his behalf.¹⁰⁷ Neither of them, however, need be thought to have been actuated entirely by a desire to help Smart, for clearly with both an interest in Mrs. Smart and her children was a strong, if not their principal, motive.

¹⁰² Support for this list and this dating of publications is to be found in the advertisements of Smart's works appended to the first and second editions of *On the Goodness* and the second of *On the Omniscience* and in the monthly lists in the *Gentleman's Magazine*

¹⁰³ "Johnson, Smart, and the *Universal Visitor*," *Modern Philology*, XXXVI (1939), 293-300

¹⁰⁴ *Rejoice in the Lamb* naturally helps greatly in illuminating this period

¹⁰⁵ J. Forster, *The Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith*, Tauchnitz Ed (Leipzig, 1873), I, 226

¹⁰⁷ Forster (*op cit*, I, 259) relates that "Among his papers at his death was found the copy of an appeal to the public for poor Kit Smart." Smart's daughter, Mrs. Le Noir, compresses much of Goldsmith's personality into the brief account she gives of her memories of his association with the family, see Blunden, *op cit.*, p 107

On the other hand, with such men as Johnson and Burney, the emphasis may have been different: they had known Smart, found him pleasant, and sincerely pitied his plight; in their minds thoughts of his family may naturally have been less prominent. Doubtless this was also true of Garrick both in his contributions to the *Visiter*¹⁰⁸ and in his benefit performance of *Merope*,¹⁰⁹ early in 1759, as well as of those who brought it about that Smart received a pension of £50 a year from the Treasury at the time of his release from confinement. Gray and Mason likewise, though neither writes so as to reveal any particular warmth of feeling toward Smart,¹¹⁰ seem both to have pitied him sincerely. Altogether the activities of Smart's friends during his confinement are a tribute both to their charity and to his ability to leave in his associates a feeling of kindly regard. There must have been much that was likable about the man.

A less pleasant aspect of his character appears from his having refused after his discharge to have anything to do with his family because of the resentment he felt over their part in his confinement. With Newbery, too, he seems to have avoided any contact; at least, he never published anything more with him, and Newbery, in turn, is most careful to provide that Smart is to receive no benefit from the bequests he makes Anna Maria Smart, his step-daughter, in his will.¹¹¹ In his resentment, Smart even began suit against someone, perhaps Newbery, if Mason and Gray are not mistaken. At the same time he showed his leading traits in the indomitable way in which he set immediately about his work. In time to be humorously dedicated as a New Year's gift to Lady Caroline Seymour, *Mrs Midnight's Orations; and Other Select Pieces* was printed for the editor. This appears to have been his effort to reestablish himself financially and again exemplified the kindness of his friends, for it was published by subscription, though "At the Desire of many of the Encouragers of this Work the Subscribers

¹⁰⁸ "Johnson, Smart, and the *Universal Visiter*," *loc cit*

¹⁰⁹ Mr Ainsworth suggests to me that the performance referred to in the following play bill, a copy of which he found in the Bodleian, may have been given at least in part for the benefit of Smart: "For the Last Time this Season For the Benefit of Mr Gaudry and Mrs Midnight At the Theatre in the Hay-Market, On Thursday, the 6th of March, 1760, will be perform'd Mrs Midnight's Concert and Oratory. As it was originally performed in the year 1754"

¹¹⁰ *Op cit*, II, 603, 801, 803.

¹¹¹ Charles Welsh, *A Bookseller of the Last Century* (London and New York, 1885), pp. 161 ff. Such provisions as the following occur three times "and I do order and direct that the same or any part thereof shall not be subject or liable to the debt power or Controul of her present Husband or to the power or Controul of any other person or persons whatsoever"

Names are omitted." On April 8, 1763, the *Song to David* was published, and according to a notice at the end of that volume proposals were out for printing by subscription Smart's new translation of the Psalms. In fact, it is there stated that "C. Say, Printer, in Newgate Street has the copy in his hands" and that "Every Book will be signed by the Author."¹¹² By the end of July, his volume of *Poems*, including among others the fable "Reason and Imagination," was ready for sale; it was listed as recently published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for that month, and the fable itself was reprinted there as from poems "just published; by the celebrated Mr Christopher Smart." That volume reveals also that no sooner did Smart resume the printing of his works than his troubles with those whom he felt to be the enemies to his reputation started anew; he there announced the *Song* as recently published and then continued

This *Song* is allowed by Mr. Smart's judicious Friends and Enemies to be the best Piece ever made public by him, its chief fault being the EXACT REGULARITY and METHOD with which it is conducted. Notwithstanding all this be the very Truth, we read the following Observations in a *scurrilous* Pamphlet, called *The Critical Review*,—"Without venturing to criticise on the Propriety of a Protestant's offering up either *Hymns* or *Prayers* to the DEAD, we must be of Opinion, that great Rapture and Devotion is discernable in this *extatic* *Song*. It is a FINE PIECE OF RUINS, and must at once please and affect a *sensible* Mind." *Critical Review* for April, 1763¹¹³ The first Part of this invidious Cavil is stupendous impudence against the Truth of CHRIT [sic] JESUS, who has most confidently affirmed this same DAVID to be alive in his Argument for the Resurrection.—The last Assertion is an Insult by a most *cruel* insinuation upon the Majesty of the LEGISLATURE of GREAT BRITAIN. — It is a pity that Men should be permitted to set up for Critics, who make it so evident, that they have neither RELIGION NOR LEARNING; since *candour* cannot subsist without the former, and there can be no Authority to pronounce *judgement* without the latter

The *Monthly Review*¹¹⁴ treated the *Song* more kindly. Though the reviewer pointed out passages that are unintelligible and objected to the

¹¹² Curiously enough, the volume was finally printed by Dryden Leach. Smart seems often to have given the impression that his works were nearer publication than the truth would warrant.

¹¹³ The italics and capitalization of phrases are Smart's. R. D. Havens ("The Structure of Smart's *Song to David*," *Review of English Studies*, XIV [1938], 178-82) clearly demonstrates "the exact regularity and method with which it is conducted." On the treatment of Smart in the *Critical Review*, see *The Early Diary of Frances Burney*, ed. by A. R. Ellis, 2 vols (London, 1907), I, 66. For a list of other notices of Smart's works in the *Monthly Review* and the *Critical Review*, see McKenzie, *op cit*, p 142.

¹¹⁴ XXVIII (1763), 320 ff.

use of "subjects too little known, and far fetched," he found "a grandeur, a majesty of thought, not without a happiness of expression," "something remarkably great, and altogether original" in at least one passage. He remarked that "from the sufferings of this ingenious Gentleman, we could not but expect the performance before us to be greatly irregular; but we shall certainly characterize it more justly, if we call it irregularly great"; and the review concluded

It would be cruel, however, to insist on the slight defects and singularities of this piece, for many reasons; and more especially, if it be true, as we are informed, that it was written when the Author was denied the use of pen, ink, and paper, and was obliged to indent his lines, with the end of a key, upon the wainscot.

Altogether, it is a sympathetic judgment.

For that reason, the tone of the review of the "Reason and Imagination" volume in September comes as a surprise; the reviewer wasted no words:

Instead of entering on the merit of these poems, we shall transcribe a few lines of Milton's Samson, and leave our readers to make the application.

This, this is he; softly awhile,
Let us not break in upon him;
O change beyond report, thought, or belief! . . .
.

By how much from the top of wondrous glory
To lowest pitch of abject fortune art thou fall'n!²²⁸

Shortly thereafter appeared Smart's *Poems on Several Occasions*, containing "Munificence and Modesty," verses addressed to Mr. Murray and others to Lady Hussey Delaval, and epitaphs on the Duchess of Cleveland, Fielding, and the Rev. James Sheeles, who died October 29, 1762. The text is followed by advertisements of his proposed translation of the Psalms, and by announcements that the *Song to David* and the volume containing "Reason and Imagination" have been recently published. The same section contains an attack on the writers of the *Monthly Review* couched in such terms as show how angry and at the same time how deeply hurt Smart was:

The Writers of the *Monthly Review*, however, after an *invidious silence* of a considerable Time, came to the final Resolution of imposing upon such Persons as had not seen the above Work, by a most *impudent* and *malicious* insinuation against the Author. They are therefore summoned to the Bar of the Publick, to answer the following *Queries*

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, XXIX (1763), 227.

Whether there is any Thing that they hate so much as Truth and Merit?

Whether they have not depended upon their *malignity*, for the Sale of their Book from the beginning?

Whether the writings of Mr *Smart* in particular (his Prize Poems excepted) have not been constantly misrepresented to the Publick, by their despicable Pamphlet?

Whether the Reverend Mr *Langhorne*¹⁰⁶ has not the poetical Department of the *Monthly Review*?

Whether a certain *scandalous fellow*, who has oppressed Mr *Smart* for these many years, did not wait upon *Griffiths*, and complain that he had been treated too mildly in a former Review?

Whether the said *scandalous fellow* did not give *Griffiths* and others Money to defame Mr *Smart*, as far as they dared?

Whether, if this was not the Case, they do not act their Mischief without Motive, and serve the Devil from affection?

The *Monthly Review* replied promptly and conclusively in its notice of the volume:

We are glad to find that, notwithstanding all that this ingenious bard has so long suffered, neither the glow of his imagination, nor the harmony of his numbers, are in the least impaired.—We say no more, as we have the mortification to learn, from some angry queries, and groundless insinuations, printed at the end of these poems, that, in spite of the sincere regard we have so often expressed, and always felt, for a writer of so much merit, he, from whatever fatality, has most unhappily misconstrued what we lately intended as a proof of our high veneration for the abilities which God so bounteously bestowed upon him.—As it appears to him so unpardonably criminal to affix any limitation whatever, to the praises which he thinks due to all his Writings, he may rest assured, that he will, for the future, have very little cause to be offended with us, on that account.¹⁰⁷

During the following year we have an account of his way of life in a letter from Hawkesworth to a sister of Smart, dated October, 1764.¹⁰⁸ From it we see him calm, apparently content, very busy, hopeful for the future, but very determined that those who he felt had injured him should not again find a place in his thoughts, or at least in his conversation. April 3 of the same year saw the performance of his

¹⁰⁶ "He is a learned and ingenious man, but I would not trust him when he reviews the works of a friend, nor indeed of an enemy, for in either case no impartiality is to be expected from him. Poor Langhorne was the same, and many a scuffle have we had about favour and resentment." So Griffiths, the proprietor of the *Monthly Review*, wrote to Edmund Cartwright. See B C Nangle, *The Monthly Review* (Oxford, 1934), p ix.

¹⁰⁷ XXIX (1763), 398. McKenzie (*op cit*, 126 f.) quotes a few caustic phrases from the review of the "Munificence and Modesty" volume in the *Critical Review*, as well as a part of a later discussion of Smart's work in the *Monthly*

¹⁰⁸ Quoted by Chalmers, Anderson, and Hunter

oratorio *Hannah* at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket with the music of Mr. Worgan. Its publication by J. and R. Tonson, with the now usual announcement of the projected translation of the Psalms, was followed shortly by the *Ode to the Right Honourable the Earl of Northumberland*, in which volume were included among other pieces "To the Honourable Mrs. Draper" and "On a Bed of Guernsey Lilies. Written in September 1763." Finally, this year saw the appearance of his *Poetical Translation of the Fables of Phaedrus*; though the title-page is dated 1765, the publication is announced among the new books in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December, 1764. It is dedicated to Master John Hussey Delaval with an allusion to the "great and frequent favours which I have received from your amiable and excellent parents." Before his confinement, Smart was never remiss in paying his respects to those who could help him, and the dedications and contents of his publications in the years after his release show that his habits had not changed in this respect. In another way, they had altered greatly; with few exceptions what he wrote during this period was of a distinctly serious, often religious, nature. Even this new version of the *Fables* is defended, in addition to the accuracy of the text, because of its lack of immorality: "it is the only one we know of that is totally free from offence; a very serious and important point in respect to tender minds."

This interest in morality and religion is obvious in Smart's next published work, the long awaited *Translation of the Psalms of David, attempted in the spirit of Christianity, and adapted to the divine service*, which probably appeared on August 12, 1765.¹¹⁹ In the prefatory matter, Smart remarks

In this translation, all expressions, that seem contrary to Christ, are omitted, and evangelical matter put in their room;—and as it was written with an especial view to the divine service, the reader will find sundry allusions to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, which are intended to render the work in general more useful and acceptable to congregations

Mr. W. Force Stead makes clear that Smart had had a version of the Psalms in mind for several years¹²⁰, and we know that he was soli-

¹¹⁹ In "An Unrecorded Work of Christopher Smart" (*TLS* [1938], 661) Mr. Ainsworth describes a copy of *A Collection of Melodies for the Psalms of David; according to the Version of Christopher Smart*, which seems to have been published late in 1765. The *Translation* itself is named among the new publications in the September *Gentleman's Magazine*

¹²⁰ "Christopher Smart's Metrical Psalms," *TLS* (1938), 677

citing subscriptions at least as early as May, 1763. Thereafter every one of his recorded publications announces the taking of subscriptions. Our fullest source of information, however, is the "Proposals," clearly second ones, which are dated September 8, 1763. There the price to subscribers is announced as 10/6, half to be paid at the time of subscribing, "the other half on the Delivery of the Book, which is ready for the Press, and will be published with all convenient speed."¹²¹ At the end is added

N. B. In Order to make the PURCHASER full amends for postponing the Work, the Paper and Print will be much better, and every Thing conducted in a more elegant Manner, than was promised in the former Proposals.

Nevertheless, several of his subscribers died before the book appeared.

The delay, we may be sure, was to Smart's advantage; a glance at the eleven-page list of subscribers is conclusive. Besides such men of literary connections as Gray (2 books), Armstrong, Akenside, Colman, Cowper, Churchill, Cumberland, Grainger, Garrick, Hawkesworth, Hogarth, Lloyd, Murphy, the Earl of Orford, Percy, Smollett, Thornton (2 books), Thomas Tyers, Joseph and Thomas Warton, Wilkes, and Whitehead; there are Gray's friend Richard Stonhewer, who had been prompter for *The Grateful Fair*; Francis Smart and Mrs. Smart, senior; Charles and Richard Burney; Mrs. Madan, senior, the Rev. Mr. Martin Madan, Mrs. Martin Madan, and the Rev. Mr. Spenser Madan, an actor in *The Grateful Fair*; the Earl of Darlington; and the Delavals in full force: Sir Francis Blake Delaval, Sir John Hussey Delaval, Lady Hussey Delaval, Ed. Delaval, Esq. (2 books), and Thomas Delaval. Clearly Smart's cultivation of the great and near-great had not been fruitless; Brigadier General Draper showed his charity and his appreciation for the honor Smart had previously done him and his family by subscribing for not less than forty copies! Altogether Smart must have realized a substantial sum from this publication.

Apparently, for some time thereafter, he was living on the proceeds of the *Psalms* and on what he could borrow from his friends¹²² and was meanwhile working on his verse translation of Horace, the four

¹²¹ It had previously been announced that the copy was in the printer's hands. See p 46, ante

¹²² "Le 22 avril 1766, le roi, que l'on avait pressenti de la part de Christopher Smart, voulu bien lui accorder la prochaine place de Pauvre Chevalier que deviendrait vacante dans la Chapelle de Saint-Georges, à Windsor. Mais, paraît-il, la place n'est pas devenue vacante avant la mort de Smart." McKenzie, *op cit*, p. 53

volumes of which Flexney, Johnson, and Caslon published in 1767. The highly complimentary dedication of this translation to the Right Honourable Sir Francis Blake Delaval shows the author to have been in no very grateful frame of mind for favors he had previously enjoyed from the reading public; he remarks

Good nature is the grace of God in grain, and so much the characteristic of an *Englishman*, that I hope everyone deserving such a name will think it somewhat hard, if a gentleman derived from ancestors, who have abode upon their own Lordship six hundred years in the County Palatine of *Durham*, should have been reduced in a manner by necessity to a work of this kind, which if done in a state, he had more reason to be satisfied with, had been more likely to have given satisfaction.

Nor is his modesty more marked than his gratitude:

I beg leave therefore to assure the Reader, that I did not set about my work without the consciousness of a talent, admitted of, and attested to, by the best scholars of the times both at home and abroad Mr Pope in particular, with whom I had the honour to correspond, entertained a very high opinion of my abilities as a translator, which one of the brightest men among our Nobility [the reference here may be to John Blake Delaval] will be ready (I trust) to certify should my veracity in this matter be called in question.

The collection of miscellaneous poems, proposals for the publication of which by subscription were printed at the ends of the second and the fourth volumes of the verse translation of Horace, seems never to have appeared. Early in 1768 *The Parables of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* made its appearance.¹²³ The title-page announces that the parables are "done into familiar verse, with occasional applications, for the use and improvement of younger minds," and the book was dedicated, on February 24, 1768, to Master Bonnell George Thornton, "Eldest Son of Bonnell and Sylvia Thornton," who was "scarce three Years of Age." In the course of a brief prefatory note, the author remarks that "in a Season [you] will reflect, I trust, with Pleasure, that you have been the Patron of a well-intended Work, almost as soon as you could go alone." Probably this was the most disinterested dedication Smart ever penned.

The rest of Smart's life is briefly told. Late in 1770 or early in the following year, the *Hymns for the Amusement of Children* was published,¹²⁴ and thereafter his finances gradually came into a more hope-

¹²³ McKenzie (*op cit.*, p. 56) assigns *Abimelech, An Oratorio* to the same year.

¹²⁴ Mr. Ainsworth tells me that this was entered in the Stationers' Register on December 24, 1770. Carnan published a third edition in 1775

less state; his literary resources were evidently exhausted, his health perhaps was breaking, and the willingness of his friends to provide for him in the style to which he was accustomed was decreasing. We catch a glimpse of him as he called on Burney on September 11, 1768—"extremely grave, and has still great wildness in his manner, looks, and voice."¹²⁶ Sometime later he was confined in the King's Bench Prison, and there, his friends having done somewhat to make life easier for him,¹²⁷ he died on May 21, 1771. That the kindness of his friends left something to be desired appears from a letter he wrote shortly before his death in which occurs, "Being upon the recovery from a fit of illness, and *having nothing to eat*, I beg you to lend me *two or three shillings*, which (God willing) I will return, with many thanks, in two or three days."¹²⁸

It is certainly not to be imagined that this survey of Smart's career in London has exhausted all our sources of information. His connection with two magazines—the *Gentleman's* and the *London*—is significant, and almost any of the periodicals of the day may yield proof of other relationships.¹²⁹ Just as we have recently learned more of his contract to produce the *Universal Visiter* and shall doubtless soon know much more of his insanity, so it is not at all improbable that chance and research will reveal more exact information concerning his marriage and his relations with his family. On the other hand, it is not to be hoped that we shall ever have a complete history of his multifarious activities. The circumstances of his life were often too obscure, his brain too fruitful, and his fondness for anonymity or pseudonymity too great for it to be possible ever to trace him in all his productions.

Fortunately, however, the information now at hand is sufficient to give us an interestingly clear view of some of his dominant characteristics. Of these probably the most striking is his almost fiery energy. Gray gives somewhat that impression in his slightly malicious, amusingly overdrawn picture of Smart rehearsing his actors for *The Grateful*

¹²⁶ Burney, *op cit*, I, 28.

¹²⁷ Thomas Carnan had obtained for him the rules of the Prison Burney "raised a kind of fund for his relief" (Burney, *op. cit*, I, 133.) Momentarily Smart reminds one of Chaucer's Clerk as he writes Burney, "I bless God for your good nature, which please take for a receipt"

¹²⁸ Anderson, *op cit*, XI, 122.

¹²⁹ Wilbur I. Cross (*The History of Henry Fielding*, II, 381) suggests that he contributed to the *Covent-Garden Journal*, Walter Graham (*English Literary Periodicals*, p. 178) lists him as a contributor to the *St James Magazine*; and Charles Welsh (*op cit*, p. 201) indicates that he wrote for William Dodd's *Christian's Magazine*

*Fair*¹²⁹; and the impression persists as one follows his life. The number and variety of his works admit of no other explanation than that he worked willingly and hard. The vigor with which he prosecuted his quarrels with his enemies and his compliments to his friends and patrons is but another manifestation of the same quality. In other ways, too, his high-strung forcefulness helped him to acquire his fairly large circle of friends and enemies. His energetic positiveness may have done much to incur Hill's enmity; and without doubt his intellectual force and agility impressed others as favorably as Tyers reported that it seems to have impressed Johnson in his first, wide-ranging interview with Smart. Finally, it was energy that enabled him, even disregarding for a moment the oft-mentioned formalizing literary influence of his age, to produce so vigorously original a poem as the *Song to David*

Consciousness of this quality and the abundance and range of his works suggests Smart's prodigality in other respects. An able man who obtained lists of subscribers ten and eleven pages in length, won prizes amounting to some £150, received much in the way of charity, and enjoyed a government pension for at least a short time—all this in addition to other sources of income less unusual to men of letters—should not have been impecunious. But, as his nephew Christopher Hunter writes, "Repeated embarrassments acting upon an imagination uncommonly fervid, produced temporary alienations of mind, which at last were attended with paroxysms so violent and continued as to render confinement necessary."¹³⁰ During Smart's time at college Gray had predicted that he "must come to a jail or Bedlam"; and certainly no prediction was ever more completely and exactly fulfilled. Perhaps Hunter was right, though somewhat euphemistic, in suggesting that "his chief fault, from which most of his other faults proceeded, was his deviations from the rules of sobriety; of which the early use of cordials in the infirm state of his childhood and his youth, might perhaps be one cause, and is the only extenuation"¹³¹ Whatever may have been the causes and extenuations of these "deviations," there can be no doubt that they largely determined the conditions of his life and the place of his death. It may even be suggested that the disorder of the liver of which Hunter says he died was cirrhosis

¹²⁹ *Op cit*, I, 273 f

¹³⁰ P xx of the 1791 edition of the *Poems*

¹³¹ *Ibid*, p xxx

A characteristic which at its best can be called a deep sensitiveness and at its worst a self-centered ingratitude also emerges clearly. It was always easy, especially at the end of his life, for him to feel that he had been injured; this tendency appears to have caused Gray to choose the phrase "lies, impertinence, and ingratitude" to describe Smart's actions in one of his earlier periods of financial stress. Later on, it may have accounted for some of the violence of his quarrel with Hill. We can never know to what degree Hill's later attacks were stimulated by the oral replies and reactions of Smart, but the proximity of the two men invites conjecture. His complete break with his family and the aggrieved manner in which he complained to Hawkesworth that all but thirteen of the hundred pounds agreed upon for his prose translation of Horace went to them have a clearly apparent relation to this characteristic; and if further illustration were necessary, much of the preface of the verse translation of Horace and the spirit in which he often received adverse criticism would serve. Even without it, no one can mistake the truth—that Smart was extremely sensitive to all that concerned him, that he probably often thought acts that were quite innocent to have been unfriendly, and that the ease with which he was wounded caused him many an unhappy hour.

However unadmirable Smart may at times appear, one can scarcely leave any prolonged study of his life and work without a strong sense of the vigor and capacity of the man. His mind was lively and fertile and his pen facile and sometimes genuinely poetic; in many ways he was well fitted for the wide variety of work he chose to do. Though he appears to have realized the height of his literary capabilities only once, that one demonstration is convincing; and the record of the kindness he met at the hands of many of his friends speaks well for both the practical charity of his era and for the fundamental worth of his character. No one wholly irascible, dissolute, and self-centered kindles such warmth in his companions.

AN ADDITION TO THE CANON OF STEPHEN CRANE

LYNDON U. PRATT

Instructor in English

Though it is commonly known that Stephen Crane received a part of his scholastic preparation at Claverack College and Hudson River Institute, near Hudson, New York, little has appeared in print concerning his attendance at that institution. Mr. Thomas Beer, Crane's biographer, gives only brief consideration to this formative period of the author's life,¹ and the only other published account—that of Crane's classmate, the late Harvey Wickham—is sketchy in content and seems prejudiced.² Recently I had the good fortune to come upon other material dealing with Crane at Claverack, thus increasing the available knowledge and perhaps correcting a few slight misapprehensions, such as the dates of Crane's stay at the school.³ One of my discoveries is what seems to be a "literary first"—a brief article on the explorer Stanley which Crane published in a student magazine, the *Vidette* (Vol. I, No. 3, February, 1890).

The Stanley article was evidently unknown in 1926 to the editor of Crane's collected work,⁴ not being reproduced in that place or elsewhere. Copies of the *Vidette* seem to be extremely rare. After failing to find any issues of the magazine in the town library of Claverack and in some of the larger university libraries of New York and other Eastern states, I interviewed alumni of the school who lived within driving distance of Claverack. Their kindness in furnishing me with other names and clues led eventually to my assembling a complete file of *Videttes* for the seven months' period of Crane's residence at Claverack following the founding of the magazine. The scarcity of copies of the *Vidette* can be accounted for by the facts that the periodical was merely a student publication, that the school was comparatively small, and that the institution went out of existence over a third of a century ago. Moreover, Claverack College and Hudson River Institute was in effect only a secondary school with a sort of junior-college extension, whose classical graduates were admitted to the junior year of

¹ Thomas Beer, *A Study in American Letters* (New York, 1924), p. 52.

² Harvey Wickham, "Stephen Crane at College," *American Mercury*, VII (1926), 297.

³ A full account of these findings is given in the opening pages of my article "The Formal Education of Stephen Crane," *American Literature*, X (1939), 460-71.

⁴ *The Work of Stephen Crane*, ed. Wilson Follett (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1925-26).

such Eastern universities as Yale, Cornell, and Syracuse.⁵ Founded in 1789 as Washington Seminary, the school had become known in 1830 as Claverack Academy. In 1854 it absorbed the Hudson River Institute, and for half a century the composite institution flourished, only to lose ground rapidly during the late 1890's. Ultimate closure was necessitated in 1902, although the ornate frame building stood for nearly a decade longer; it was finally torn down at the request of the Claverack townsfolk, who did not relish the procession of hoboes that made the old structure a stopping-place.

Because Crane's article on Stanley is practically inaccessible, reprinting is desirable. I do not doubt there may be extant other copies of the *Vidette* for February, 1890, and this notice of their interesting contents may serve to bring them to light.

Crane's article follows:

HENRY M. STANLEY

For many centuries the interior of the great continent of Africa was unknown and unexplored. The countries bordering on the Mediterranean had contributed to the history of the civilized world. The entire coast of the continent was known to commerce and travel, but the vast tract of land lying between the Desert of Sahara and the colonized districts in the south was a place unexplored, a land about which fabulous tales of powerful empires, beautiful cities and immense wealth were told. The rivers, lakes and mountains were mysteries unsolved.

The first explorer who contributed largely to the science and the geography of Africa was David Livingstone, the English missionary. He gave thirty years of his life to missionary work in Africa. In his endeavor to christianize even the most remote tribes, he made many valuable discoveries. His last great undertaking was an effort to discover the sources of the Nile. For months nothing was heard of him. He was supposed to be wandering somewhere among the jungles of Central Africa, no one knew where. The people of every enlightened

⁵ Franklin Ellis, *History of Columbia County* (Philadelphia, 1878), p. 243. See also *Thirty-sixth Annual Catalog of Claverack College and Hudson River Institute* (Hudson, N. Y., 1890), p. 22; Sidney Sherwood, "The University of the State of New York: History of Higher Education in the State of New York," *United States Bureau of Education, Circular of Information No. 3* (Washington, 1900), p. 470; George F. Miller, *The Academy System of the State of New York* (Albany, 1922), p. 88.

nation of the globe were troubled over his fate. Rumors of his death filtered out from tribe to tribe until they reached the coast. England, for whose benefit he had invaded the Dark Continent, made no attempt at a rescue, and had virtually given him up as dead.

While people and press were wondering over the fate of the aged explorer, James Gordon Bennett, the editor of the *New York Herald*, conceived the idea of sending an expedition to find Livingstone. In looking about for a man who had qualities to command such an expedition he decided on Henry M. Stanley, then a war correspondent of the *Herald* in Spain during the Carlist insurrection. He sent for Stanley and in a short interview informed him of his scheme. The substance and, in fact, nearly the sum of his directions was: "Go and find Livingstone." A short and concise sentence, but it meant over a year of peril and privation, of suffering and toil for Stanley and those who followed on his great journey into the unknown.

In six months he found Livingstone, a lonely white man in the middle of Africa, very ill; probably dying. Livingstone refused to return with Stanley, because *he knew* he was dying and chose to remain and try to finish his work among the negroes. In vain Stanley plead [*sic*] with him—he preferred to die at his post. And reluctantly, because without his friend, Stanley commenced his march toward the coast. A little way from the village where Livingstone resided they parted. One turned toward home, friends, and country, the other turned his face toward the heart of Africa—away from all he loved except his duty.

In due time Stanley reached the coast and afterwards Europe and America. His fame had gone before him, and he was everywhere welcomed with applause and congratulations [*sic*] But he was not destined to enjoy the rest after labor, for Mr. Bennett again sent him to Africa: this time to explore the Victoria Nyanza and other inland lakes. This he successfully accomplished and returned by way of the Congo river, making one of the most remarkable journeys ever known. Then from 1879 to 1884 he was occupied with his great Congo undertaking, the result of which was the establishment of an independent nation on the western coast.

After this had been accomplished, he returned to America hoping to spend the remainder of his life in less arduous labors, but again he was asked to go to the interior of Africa, to rescue the imperilled Emin Pacha. After many privations and the loss of many men he reached Emin, but here the same difficulty interposed itself as with Livingstone.

Emin, the faithful, refused to return with Stanley and desert his native followers. But finally circumstances changing he was induced to return. Stanley and he arrived at Zanzibar in December, 1889. The geographical results of this expedition are of even more importance than the preceding ones. The features of the country are now located and described with certainty and precision. The success of all these expeditions seem [sic] to have resulted from Stanley's indomitable will and faith in a Supreme Power, who guided him through the forests and valleys of the great continent. His black followers became deeply attached to him, and he never forgot their love. Even when he was being feted and flattered by kings he could remember the many lonely graves, under the equatorial sun, of followers who had died by the way. In his descriptive letters to the *New York Herald* and other papers, he gives himself no credit for the success of his expedition. He ends his letter with the sentence: "Praise be to God forever and ever." Such was a fitting end to his first letter after a return from the perils of the jungles and glades of Africa.

His simplicity and modesty form a prominent part of his character. He who had lived in constant peril of the javelins and poisoned arrows of hostile tribes for months, who, with his little band, had fought battles every day for weeks, gives no eloquent description of his exploits to an admiring world. But from his simple description the world easily sees the tremendous obstacles he must have overcome, and instantly lionizes him, giving him a place among the great men of the earth, where he should ever rank not only as a great christian explorer, but as a great statesman and a great general.

—S. CRANE

THE FRENCH LABOR MOVEMENT 1880-95

HAROLD E. BLINN

Instructor in History and Political Science

The timid efforts at labor organization during the years immediately following the Paris Commune were necessarily conservative. The year 1876, however, marked the entrance of a radical, socialistic element into the French labor movement, and by the end of 1879 organized labor in France seemed definitely committed to the principles of socialism.¹ But having won the French laboring class to their banner, the socialists at once began to divide into numerous quarrelsome factions, this tendency toward schism first making its appearance when Jules Guesde, at the national labor congress of 1880 (at Havre) attempted to commit the workers' organizations to a common Minimum Program.² When the congress assembled, the moderate majority re-

¹ Joseph Barberet, *Le travail en France, monographies professionnelles* (7 vols., Nancy, 1886), I, 15-19; Georges Weill, *Histoire du mouvement sociale en France* (Paris, 1924), pp. 12, 186-88, 192; James Guillaume, *L'internationale, documents et souvenirs* (4 vols., Paris, 1905), *passim*; *Almanac du Parti Ouvrier pour 1892* (Lille 1892), pp. 17-20, 25-29; the best account of the post-commune revival and its capture by the socialists is Maxwell R. Kelso, "The Inception of the Modern French Labor Movement (1871-79) A Reappraisal," in the *Journal of Modern History*, VIII (June, 1936), 173-93.

² Alexandre Zévats, *Les Guesdistes* (Paris, 1911), p. 7; Maxine Leroy, *Syndicats et services publics* (Paris, 1909), p. 85; Leon de Seilhac, *Les congrès ouvriers en France* (Paris, 1899), pp. 62-63; Weill, *op cit.*, p. 324. The Minimum Program—drawn up in London by Guesde, Paul Lafargue, Marx, and Engels—consisted of two parts, one political and the other economic. The political part contained the following items: (1) abolition of the laws restricting the press, unions and associations, and the International, and of the articles of the Civil Code making the workman inferior as against the employer; (2) return of the property of religious orders to the state; (3) general armament of the people; (4) communes to manage their own administration, police, and profitable public functions. The economic part consisted of the following points: (1) six-day week, eight-hour day, regulation of child labor, and supervision of apprentices by labor corporations; (2) minimum wages, fixed yearly according to the price of foodstuffs; (3) equal wages for the two sexes in the same work; (4) technical and scientific education for children, maintained by society; (5) provision for the aged and for victims of industrial accidents; (6) administration of production to be managed by the workers; (7) responsibility of employers for industrial accidents—to be guaranteed by insurance; (8) participation by workers in the formulation of factory rules; (9) return of banks, railroads, mines, etc., to the state, the exploitation of each state enterprise being entrusted to the workers engaged therein; (10) abolition of direct taxes and the substitution of a progressive tax on all incomes over 3000 francs; (11) suppression of all inheritance in collateral lines, and in the direct line for values over 20,000 francs; (12) cessation of alienation of land by communes or the state; (13) provision by municipalities of funds to erect houses and other buildings to be rented without profit (Seilhac, *op cit.*, pp. 59-61).

fused to recognize the credentials of numerous Guesdist delegates, with the result that the latter withdrew, held a separate meeting, and set up an independent organization.

In large part the division of the labor movement into rival factions was due to personal rivalries and jealousies. Guesde was charged with claiming doctrinal infallibility, with being too favorable to Marxian ideas, and with subjection to Marx's personal influence—charges which Guesde and Engels, on behalf of Marx, denied in vain.³ The differences, however, were not wholly personal; Guesde had advocated social revolution and had urged the realization of the new socialist regime through a single great reorganization of society, whereas Paul Brousse headed an essentially reformist and evolutionary element, caring more for the immediate realization of practicable measures.⁴ Differences between these two groups became prominent during 1881 and led to an open break at the Congress of St Etienne in 1882.⁵ Other factions were the Allemanists, who openly bolted the Broussist group in 1890, charging the latter with devoting too much attention to political activity⁶; the Radical Socialist Party, founded in 1882⁷; and the Blanquists, most radical of all socialist groups, who formed a Central Revolutionary Committee in 1881 and themselves became divided into two rival factions in 1889.⁸ Finally there were the Independent Socialists, who felt that the party form of organization was too rigid, its method too formal, and its programs conceived in a spirit too dogmatic and sectarian.⁹

³ Sylvan Humbert, *Les possibilistes* (Paris, 1911), pp 7-10, "Lettres inédites de Frederick Engels," in *Le mouvement socialiste*, IV (1900), 517-18.

⁴ Humbert, *op cit*, p 6, gives extracts from *Le Proletaire* (edited by Brousse) and *L'Égalité* (Guesde's paper) illustrating these divergent views, see also Zévaès, *op cit*, pp 22-23, *Almanac du Parti Ouvrier pour 1892*, pp 15-17.

⁵ Zévaès, *op cit*, pp 23-25, Humbert, *op cit*, pp 3-5; Seilhaç, *op cit*, pp 93-97.

⁶ Seilhaç, *op cit*, pp 160-80, Humbert, *op cit*, pp 64-65, 66-67, 68-69, 70-74, Maurice Charnay, *Les allemanistes* (Paris, 1912), p 15.

⁷ Albert Orry, *Les socialistes indépendants* (Paris, 1911), p 7; Alexandre Zévaès, *Le socialisme en France depuis 1871* (Paris, 1908), p 51.

⁸ Charles da Costa, *Les Blanquists* (Paris, 1912), pp 52, 55-58, 59-60; Zévaès, *Le socialisme*, pp 65-69.

⁹ Orry, *op cit*, pp 3, 5, 9, 10, 14; Zévaès, *Le socialisme*, pp 47-48. This group consistently sought to bring about a union of all socialist groups. The *Cri du peuple*, founded by Jules Valles in 1883, and *La Revue socialiste*, established by Benoît Malon in 1885, urged such a union. The Independent Socialists enjoyed more political success than any other group (See *La Revue socialiste*, I [1885], p. 1, for a complete statement of its editorial policy.)

The factional disintegration of the socialist forces had far-reaching effects upon the labor movement. As each new division appeared within the socialist ranks, it sought labor support for its own program and, with that purpose in mind, sought to promote the organization of labor into effective unions for the promotion of that particular socialistic creed.¹⁰ Such attitudes, of course, promoted the formation of labor syndicates but gave them a distinctly political character; they were organized primarily for electoral purposes and were made to serve the interests of the political group to which their members adhered. The net result of this situation was unfortunate for the labor movement, for labor found that its attempts to achieve unified organization were constantly hampered by political rivalries. Different trades opposed each other politically, and even within the same trade and within individual syndicates the division was often very pronounced, the consequent difficulty of securing united action in other than political fields is evident. The case of the mechanics union of the Department of the Seine must suffice to indicate the general situation, some of its leaders repudiated socialism and supported the moderates after the break with Guesde in 1880, others upheld the Minimum Program of the Parti Ouvrier Français,¹¹ still others adhered to the Broussist organization, and, finally, some followed Alleman in the founding of his Revolutionary Socialist Labor Party (Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionnaire) in 1890.¹²

The Socialists, however, were not alone in bringing disruption into the labor movement. The state had not yet granted legal recognition to the syndicates, and they therefore had no civil personality; employers, of course, opposed any movement for the organization of labor and, whenever possible, blacklisted workers who became members of syndical chambers. Since the extension of the syndical movement was accompanied by a steadily increasing number of strikes in French industrial establishments, the antagonism of employers to such organizations is not hard to understand.¹³ Even the workers themselves were often-

¹⁰ Seilham, *op cit*, p 124, Leon Blum, *Les congres ouvrier et socialistes* (Paris, 1910), p 93; Louis Levine, *Syndicalism in France* (New York, 1914), p 60.

¹¹ This name was assumed by the Guesdists following the Congress of Havre, 1880.

¹² Pierre Coupat, "L'union des ouvriers mécaniciens de la Seine," in *La mouvement socialiste*, IV (1900), 736, 744. At the Congress of Tours (1896) a case was cited of a railroad syndicat whose membership had been reduced from 400 to 80 as a result of these divisions (Maurice Claverie, "Socialisme et syndicates," in *La revue socialiste*, XXXII [1900], 309).

times not enthusiastic about entering the syndicats, disliking the necessary assessments, and non-members resented the domineering attitude of the syndicats, which aimed at advancing the interests not only of their members but of all workers as a class.¹⁴ Under such unfavorable circumstances, the membership of the labor organizations frequently amounted to only a very small percentage of the total number of persons engaged in a given occupation.¹⁵ With even these small groups becoming divided on the issue of socialism, the impuissance of the syndical movement is self-evident.

The year 1884 is a landmark in the history of French labor organization, for it saw the enactment of a bill legalizing the foundation of syndicats. Such a project had long been under consideration, but the fear of fostering a proletarian movement which might encourage social revolution had heretofore prevented favorable action from being taken. The law of 1884 granted to employers or laborers engaged in the same occupation the right to organize syndicats without special governmental authorization for the purposes of study and defense of economic, social, and agricultural interests; such syndicats should have corporate personality before the law. The syndicats were required to deposit a copy of their statutes and the names of their officers with the government; strikes were authorized, but the employment of threats, violence, or assault during a strike remained a criminal offense. Syndicats were granted the further right of federation, but the federations were not to be allowed to hold property or to appear in court as corporate personalities.¹⁶

As a result of these concessions, the number of syndicats increased rapidly,¹⁷ but the law of 1884 by no means completely satisfied the

¹⁴ A table indicating the number of strikes and strikers for the years 1880-95, together with the outcome of each strike, is given in *Annuaire Statistique de la France* (Nancy), 1889, p. 407; 1902, p. 415.

¹⁵ Weill, *op. cit.*, pp. 345-47, Emile Pouget, *La Confédération du Travail* (Paris, 1908), p. 5.

¹⁶ *Rapport fait au nom de la commission d'enquête parlementaire*, published in annexes to the *Journal officiel*, March, April, May, 1884 (hereinafter referred to as *Rapport de la quarante-quatre commission*), *passim*, thus in Paris the zinc-workers and gas-fitters syndicat included only 450 of the 15,000 workers, the syndicat of the makers of pasteboard boxes 600 of 1800, the excavators syndicat 150 of 14,000, the porcelain-makers syndicat 150 of 3000, the painters syndicat 460 of 16,000, see also *Journal des économistes* (September, 1884), p. 351.

¹⁷ *Journal officiel de la république française*, March 22, 1884, pp. 1577-78.

¹⁸ Tables indicating the growth of syndicats following the enactment of the law of 1884 may be consulted in *Annuaire Statistique de la France* (Nancy), 1902, p. 414, or in *Annuaire des syndicats professionnelles*, XVI (1909), xxxi-xxxii. These figures, however, are not completely accurate, for they include only those

demands of the workers, who were especially roused by the publicity requirements. The weakness of the individual syndicats in the face of the continued opposition of the employers promoted the development of syndical federations. The chief incentive to the creation of such federations was the failure of a great proportion of the strikes undertaken by individual syndicats.¹⁸ These failures indicated that the single unions were ineffective weapons against employers; many strikes had failed because the employers were able to continue their operations by bringing in workers from neighboring towns and districts. The remedy for this situation seemed obviously to federate the various syndicats in a given industry, that they might support each other. Indeed, the first such federation had been created as early as 1876,¹⁹ and by 1884 there were ten such organizations in existence. The opposition of employers to the law of March 21, 1884, undoubtedly contributed to the organization of additional federations during the following years.²⁰

The next step, it seemed to many labor leaders, should be the creation of a national federation of all labor syndicats, and this question was accordingly placed on the agenda of a national syndical congress held at Lyons in 1886.²¹ Dominated by Guesdists,²² the congress voted the creation of a National Federation of Syndicats, which was to be federal in nature, each syndicat retaining complete autonomy in the

syndicats which complied with the requirements of the law of 1884; actually there were 238 workers' syndicats and 184 employers' syndicats already in existence when the law of 1884 was passed, and in 1893 the Paris bourse du travail was closed because only 150 of the 270 syndicats which belonged to it had complied with the requirements of the act of 1884. The figures regarding individual membership are likewise not wholly trustworthy, for the syndicats were prone to pad their reports in order to win prestige and attract more members (See *L'Economiste français*, Sept 20, 1884, p 363, Jan 21, 1893, pp. 67-69.)

¹⁸ Of 753 strikes occurring between 1874 and 1886, 57% failed, 16% were settled by compromise, and only 27% were successful; four-fifths of these strikes had been called in order to obtain increased wages, with wage reductions and protests against existing conditions of labor forming the next most frequent causes (*L'Economiste français*, June, 1891, 774-75.) An analysis of the strikes from 1880 to 1895 except 1881, 1887, 1888, and 1889 may be found in *Annuaire Statistique*, 1889, p 407, 1902, p 415.

¹⁹ J. A. Estey, *Revolutionary Syndicalism* (London, 1913), p 13, Weill, *op. cit.*, p 353; A. Hamelin, "La federation française des travailleurs du livre," in *La mouvement socialiste*, II (1899), 720-22; *Annuaire Statistique*, 1902, p 414.

²⁰ A table showing the growth of syndical federations is given in *Annuaire Statistique*, 1902, p 414.

²¹ Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp 192-93.

²² Each syndicat represented at the congress was allowed one vote regardless of its membership; the moderate strength lay in the South, where the syndicats were large, whereas the revolutionaries from the North represented small syndicats. (Seilhac, *op. cit.*, p 194.)

administration of its own affairs.²³ Throughout the following years, the National Federation remained wholly subservient to Guesde's Parti Ouvrier Français²⁴

Subjected to a control which was interest primarily in political success and in labor organization only as a means to that end, the National Federation encountered the obstacles which had caused the individual unions so much difficulty. Non-Guesdist syndicats refused to become members of the Guesdist Federation, and no common interest could be found to overcome the divergent policies which were dividing the labor movement against itself. Nor was the form of organization attempted an effective one; provision of intermediary units—such as local, regional, or trade federations—might have given the National Federation of Syndicats a chance for success, but the feeling of class consciousness was not yet fully enough developed to permit the successful organization of a general federation of all local syndicats such as this body purported to be.²⁵ In addition to these internal weaknesses, the National Federation was soon handicapped by the appearance of a formidable rival in the field of labor organization: the bourses du travail and their national organization, the Federation of Bourses.

The bourses were originally created to serve simply as employment bureaus, but their functions were quickly expanded and came to include the establishment of headquarters for all syndicats in a given locality, the holding of syndical meetings, the distribution of information of interest to laborers, the organization of educational courses, and the maintenance of libraries.²⁶ The bourses were similar to the National Federation of Syndicats, in that they aimed at a general union of all organized trades, but they had the great advantage that they were local organizations, capable of gathering local laborers continuously in common fellowship and thereby creating a spirit of class solidarity. Seeing the disruption which political activity had brought to the syndical movement, the bourses avoided politics and excluded the bourgeois elements from membership, because it was felt they were the ones most likely to advocate giving a political complexion to the movement. This repudiation of political aspirations caused the governing authorities to

²³ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 196-99, Blum, *op cit*, pp 104-05

²⁴ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 204-05, 213-16, Weill, *op cit*, p 283; Leroy, *op. cit.*, p 95.

²⁵ Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp 195, 228, Levine, *op cit.*, pp. 62-63, 95-96.

²⁶ Eatey, *op cit*, p 17; Fernand Pelloutier, *Histoire des bourses du travail* (Paris, 1902), pp 63-64. Pelloutier has a good chapter on the work of the bourses (pp 85-148)

favor the bourses as against the socialistic unions, and many municipalities regularly supplied subsidies for the support of their local bourses.²⁷ This governmental favor attracted ever more syndicats to the bourses and promoted the growth of the new movement.²⁸ By January 1, 1892, fourteen bourses were in existence.²⁹

"The idea of federating the bourses du travail was inevitable"³⁰ The organization of a congress to achieve such a union was undertaken by the bourse of St. Etienne. The congress was held February 7-10, 1892, ten of the existing fourteen bourses being represented. Dominated by anti-Guesdism (especially by the Allemanists), the congress pronounced against political activity and in favor of direct action. It was resolved that the workers should "... repulse in an absolute fashion the interference of administrative and governmental powers in the functioning of the bourses," and a National Federation of Bourses was set up, having as its objectives the unification of the laborers' syndicats and the realization of their demands, extension of the activity of the bourses, appointment of delegates to the National Secretariat of Labor,³¹ collection and distribution of statistical data, and a means to provide general free placement of workers in all trades, the decisions of the Federation were to be executed by a committee composed of one delegate appointed by each member bourse. This committee should have no authority over the individual acts of local bourses.³²

Besides attracting attention on account of its novelty, the new federation developed because it fulfilled a very definite need of the syndicats and the laboring class; its leaders were united in being interested in the syndicats as economic rather than as political organizations, and because of the municipal subventions, the bourses were not threatened by the insecurity of financial support. In disavowing poli-

²⁷ A table indicating the number of bourses formed between 1887 and 1895, the number of member syndicats, together with the total individual membership, and the subsidies granted from municipal and departmental funds is given in *Annuaire Statistique*, 1902, pp 112-13.

²⁸ Seilhac, *op cit*, p 228, Pelloutier, *op cit*, p 65.

²⁹ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 71-74, Paul Delesalle, *Les bourses du travail et la confédération générale du travail* (Paris, 1910), pp 3-4.

³⁰ Pelloutier, *op cit*, p 64.

³¹ An International Socialist Congress at Brussels in 1891 had urged the creation in all countries of National Secretariats to unify the labor and socialist movements throughout the world. In France, political differences among the socialists and quarrels between the political and non-political labor elements had prevented the National Secretariat from accomplishing anything, and it died in 1896 (Levine, *op cit*, p. 64).

³² Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 229-31, 318, Pelloutier, *op cit*, pp 64-65.

tical ambitions, the Federation of Bourses avoided the most frequent source of discord which had plagued the socialist-syndical movement. The addition of another national organization, however, could only add to the confusion of the labor movement in France, unless some means of uniting at least a part of the separate organizations could be found. There were at this time eight national labor groups of one type or another.⁸⁵ Fortunately, a possibility of uniting at least some of the more important of these units seemed to be arising from the progress of the idea of the general strike.

The idea of the general strike was a natural result of the formation of the National Federation of Syndicats, whose national congress at Bordeaux-Bouscat in 1888⁸⁶ adopted a resolution favoring the general strike.⁸⁷ and the Allemanists voted resolutions approving it in their congresses of 1891 (Paris) and 1892 (St. Quentin).⁸⁸ The bourses turned to the general strike as the best means of direct action, to which they were committed. In the first week of September, 1892, the bourses of St. Nazaire and Nantes sent delegates to a regional Guesdist congress at Tours; the influence of these representatives and the argument of Fernand Pelloutier secured the adoption of a resolution endorsing the general strike.⁸⁹ A few days later (September 22), the congress of the National Federation of Syndicats opened at Marseilles, with the general strike as the most important question before it. After listening to considerable oratory, the congress passed a resolution urging the spreading of the principle of the general strike among the working class by the two national federations and the preparation of a complete project for such a strike, to be laid before the International Congress of 1893; the Manifestation of May 1, 1893, was designated for use in the promotion of the general strike.⁹⁰ This common approval of the general strike by the Federation of Bourses, the Allemanists, the Guesdists, and the National Federation of Syndicats tended to draw them together; and

⁸⁵ National Federation of Syndicats, National Federation of Bourses, National trade federations, Parti Ouvrier Français (Guesdists), Federation of Socialist Workmen of France (Broussists), Revolutionary Socialist Labor Party (Allemanists), Union of Labor Syndicats (co-operatives), and the National Secretariat of Labor.

⁸⁶ The police broke up the meeting at Bordeaux when the delegates refused to remove a red flag from their convention hall, and the sessions were continued at Bouscat. (See Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp. 213-14)

⁸⁷ Seilhac, *op. cit.*, p. 215

⁸⁸ Blum, *op. cit.*, p. 125

⁸⁹ Pelloutier, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67, Weill, *op. cit.*, pp. 285

⁹⁰ Pelloutier, *op. cit.*, p. 67, Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-35

this rapprochement was furthered still more by several events of 1892-93.

The first of these events was a spectacular miners' strike at Carmaux,³⁹ one result of which was a greater feeling of solidarity among the whole working class of France. The Carmaux affair was followed immediately by a rapid increase of strikes throughout the country, and as a large proportion of these strikes (and a still larger proportion of the strikers involved) were unsuccessful,⁴⁰ the feeling that individual strikes were unsatisfactory weapons naturally grew. The action of the government in closing the Paris bourse du travail on July 7, 1893, for its failure to comply with the legal provision requiring the deposit of certain information with the government⁴¹ likewise increased the feeling of labor solidarity and the opposition toward the "brutality" of the established authorities.⁴²

In February, 1893, the national congress of the Federation of Bourses, meeting at Toulouse, had requested the National Federation of Syndicats to participate in a joint congress in Paris for the purpose of unifying the labor movement.⁴³ The invitation had been accepted, and the joint congress now opened (July 18, 1893) under circumstances

³⁹ Calvignac, a miner, had been chosen mayor of Carmaux in the May elections, and on July 31 was elected councillor of the arrondissement, in opposition to a candidate of the mining company by which he was employed. On August 2 Calvignac was discharged by the company, and, on the 16th, 3000 miners went on strike after his reinstatement had been refused. The circumstances of the strike attracted wide attention to it, the government sent 1800 troops to maintain order, and Ferroul, Boyer, and Baudin, socialist Deputies, came to aid and encourage the strikers. Socialist newspapers organized subscriptions for the strikers, and several departmental councils and many municipal councils sent subsidies. As the conflict continued to defy settlement, the question was finally (October 18, 1892) carried into the Chamber of Deputies, and Loubet, president of the council, was delegated to attempt to arbitrate between the company and the strikers; Loubet's efforts were quickly rewarded, and the strike was ended on November 3, Calvignac and all the strikers except those who had been sentenced to prison for violence (ten in number) being reinstated. (John Labusquierre, *La troisième république* [Paris, 1908], p. 262; Daniel André, *L'Année politique* [Paris, 1892], pp. 256-57, 270-72. The best account of the Carmaux strike seems to be an article written by P. de Rousiers in *Science sociale*, XIV, 317 ff.)

⁴⁰ *Annuaire Statistique*, 1889, p. 407; 1902, p. 415.

⁴¹ The law of 1884 required that the statutes and names of the officers of each syndicat be deposited with the government. Of the 270 syndicats which belonged to the bourse, only 150 had made the required deposits. On June 2, 1893, therefore, M. Poubelle, Prefect of the Seine, notified the syndicats that they must meet the requirements of the law by July 6; on that date, since many of the syndicats had not yet complied, the bourse was closed by troops on the order of M. Dupuy, Minister of Interior. (Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-38; Pelloutier, *op. cit.*, p. 68.)

⁴² Blum, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴³ Seilhac, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-37.

which could hardly have been more favorable to its avowed purpose. The first act of the congress was to vote a protest against the "... repressive measures taken by the government against the working class." The question of unification was then considered, the result being the adoption of a resolution that, as soon as possible, all existing syndicates should adhere to their trade federations or create such where they did not yet exist and also organize local bourses du travail. These trade federations and bourses should adhere to their respective national federations, and it was further planned that these two national groups should then set up a joint organization, with a central committee composed of two delegates from each trade federation and four each from the Federation of Bourses and the National Federation of Syndicates. Finally, the congress passed a resolution upholding the general strike.⁴⁴

Nantes had been selected as the seat of the next (1894) congress of the National Federation of Syndicates; and the Federation of Bourses, at its regular congress in June, 1894, decided to send delegates to the congress at Nantes also, with a view to completing the fusion of the two organizations.⁴⁵ The old incompatibility between the two federations had, however, already begun to reappear as the memory of the events of 1893 grew dimmer and as an ebbing in the strike movement followed the great wave of that year.⁴⁶ Further, the Guesdists, now realizing that promotion of the general strike idea would involve a greater diminution of political activity than they had anticipated in 1892, had come to regret their endorsement of it. Consequently, when the congress met, old antagonisms were revived, stormy sessions prevailed,⁴⁷ and finally the Guesdists withdrew from the meeting. The rump congress again approved the general strike and proceeded to set up a National Labor Council, which was intended to form a central organization for all the syndicates in France.⁴⁸ The rupture at Nantes proved to be a death-blow for the National Federation of Syndicates; even at the time of the break, many of its representatives refused to follow the Guesdists and remained in the congress. The Federation held only one more national congress—at Treves in 1895—and soon thereafter became merged into the general organization of the Parti

⁴⁴ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 239-41, Pelloutier, *op cit*, pp 68-69

⁴⁵ Seilhac, *op cit* p 261

⁴⁶ In 1893 there were 634 strikes involving 170,123 workers, in 1894 these figures dropped to 391 and 54,576 (*Annuaire Statistique*, 1902, p 415)

⁴⁷ Secretary Cordier refused to continue the *procès-verbal*, declaring it an impossibility

⁴⁸ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp 263-68, 286, Pelloutier, *op cit*, pp 69-70

Ouvrier Français.⁸⁰ The Congress of Nantes thus terminated the union which had prevailed since the Congress of Marseilles in 1879 between the political labor movement and the economic labor movement, and the Federation of Bourses was left definitely in control of the latter.

The Federation of Bourses, however, had its limitations as a national labor organization, because syndicats existed in many small towns where bourses could not be maintained, and because it did not admit to membership any federations of trades or industries (to avoid overlapping, which it was felt would result from including both unions of craft and unions of locality).⁸⁰

In September, 1895, a national congress of those syndicats which had not followed Guesde in leaving the Congress of Nantes met at Limoges.⁸¹ The report of the National Labor Council showed that it had accomplished nothing.⁸² Accordingly, a new organization was set up, its membership being open to individual syndicats or bourses, to local unions of syndicats, to departmental, regional, or national federations of syndicats, and to the National Federation of Bourses. The administration of this new body was entrusted to a National Council, seated at Paris and composed of one delegate from each member organization except the national trade federations and the National Federation of Bourses, which should have three delegates each. The new organization was given the title of *Confédération Générale du Travail*, and its aim was declared to be exclusively to unite the workingmen "... in the economic domain and by bonds of class solidarity, in the struggle for their integral emancipation," a rather vague formula which was designed to satisfy all conceptions of its purposes, but which definitely repudiated political action as a means of emancipating the proletariat. The distribution of propaganda and the use of the general strike were made regular parts of its program.⁸³ The Congress of Limoges thus deprived the socialists, already checked at the Congress of Nantes, of their last hope of retaining leadership in the syndical movement. With the disappearance of the National Federation of Syndicats and the passing of the National Labor Secretariat in 1896, the Federation of Bourses and the General Confederation of Labor, both committed to the principles of economic syndicalism, were left

⁸⁰ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp. 278-79; Levine, *op cit*, p. 72

⁸¹ Estey, *op cit*, pp. 23-24

⁸² Eighteen bourses were also represented.

⁸³ It had only eighty-five centimes in its treasury and debts of forty-five francs

⁸⁴ Seilhac, *op cit*, pp. 280-89.

in complete domination over the labor movement in France; in 1902 these two organizations were formally fused.

The movement for labor organization in France after the Commune did not run uninterruptedly or smoothly toward its goal; rather, it was full of cross currents and backwashings which at times seemed to threaten the whole movement with disaster and failure. Confusion was far more prevalent than order or consistent plan. In part, the difficulties were those of youth, which contributed to the disagreement among the leaders of the movement as to the direction and aims to which it should be committed, to the hesitancy of the laboring class to rally to the movement, and to the distrust with which the government and the bourgeois employers regarded it. Since the socialist activity in neighboring Germany had developed internal social hostilities which finally resulted in the anti-socialist laws of 1878, it is not to be wondered that the imposition of socialism on French labor organization by 1879-80 was regarded with great apprehension.

Tradition was also an important factor in hampering the progress of labor organization. Before the Commune, Prudhonian ideals had dominated labor philosophy in France, and Marxism was scarcely known. Some few sections of the International had been established in France, but these disappeared during the Commune, and a law was afterwards passed forbidding their re-establishment. Consequently, when labor organization began to revive, it was led by moderates and dominated by the mutualistic and co-operative ideals of Prudhon. Nor were the socialists successful in entirely overcoming this tradition.⁵⁴ In 1888 the moderate Paris *syndicats* formed the Union of Workers and began publishing *Le moniteur des syndicats ouvriers* as their official journal; although the Union failed to become a very powerful organization, the existence of such a force in rivalry with the socialistic element had the same sort of disorganizing effect upon the labor move-

⁵⁴ A report of 1881 notes the creation of twenty-three new co-operatives at Paris during the preceding year and states that the seventy-one co-operative associations then existing had a total capital of five million francs. An extra-parliamentary inquest on such associations resulted in a report in 1885 which indicated that, although the co-operatives were by no means great rivals of the socialists' organizations, a considerable number of them (seventy-four) still existed, a decree of June 4, 1888, authorized them to bid for public-works contracts (such a concession for Paris municipal works had been granted on July 26, 1882), with the result that the movement gained new strength (See É. Levasseur, *Questions ouvrières et industrielles en France sous la troisième république* [Paris, 1907], p. 742; Pierre Waldeck-Rousseau, *Questions Sociales* [Paris, 1900], p. 132).

ment as a whole as did the quarrels among the socialists themselves. And the anti-authoritarian tradition which had prevailed among French laborers stood as an obstacle to a common program and contributed materially to Guesde's failure to impose his Minimum Program.⁸⁵

French individualism must also bear a part of the responsibility for the trials of this early labor movement; this trait contributed greatly to the internal divisions among the socialists. The outstanding leadership necessary to overcome this individualism was lacking, and disruption therefore inevitably resulted. The alliance of the labor forces with politics was especially unfortunate in this respect, for in few fields of normal human activity do men so like to express their individualism as in politics. Yet without a political connection, the leaders felt that the movement would be powerless, for it had no effective organization capable of securing recognition for its demands. Individual local syndicates were wholly unable to perform such a function. Aims and ideals soon lose their attractiveness when no means of realizing them is available; the rapid decline of the moderate labor element following the rupture at the Congress of Havre provides an excellent example of the indifference which resulted from lack of accomplishment.

Perhaps the most fundamental factor, however, was the absence of a really extensive industrial proletariat, on which a successful labor movement must necessarily be based. The report of the Forty-Four Commission reveals that in 1881 the industrial population in France totalled only 3,180,902, out of a national population of 37,627,048—less than ten per cent.⁸⁶ Nor was this proportion materially altered by 1895. Basing his figures on an industrial census taken in 1896,⁸⁷ Clapham finds that in that year there were some 575,000 "industrial establishments" in France, employing an average of 5.5 workers each. Of the total, only 151 establishments had 1000 or more workers, over 400,000 had but one or two workers, and another 80,000 had only three or four; 534,000 of the total employed fewer than ten laborers.⁸⁸ The great factory employing thousands of workers simply did not exist, and hence the feeling of class solidarity which it would have engendered was lacking. A "factory" employing only one to four workers, one of

⁸⁵ See Kelso's article in *Journal of Modern History*, VIII (June, 1936), p. 193.

⁸⁶ *Rapport de la quarante-quatre commission*, 171. Of this industrial population, 2,005,507 persons were men, and 1,175,395 were women.

⁸⁷ *Résultats statistiques du recensement professionnel en 1896*.

⁸⁸ John H. Clapham, *The Economic History of France and Germany* (Cambridge, England, 1921), p. 258.

whom frequently might be the employer himself, could not be an effective agency in promoting labor solidarity. The figures for the total urban population tell a similar story. In 1881, 13,096,542 of the 37,627,048 inhabitants of France were classified as "urban," and in 1896 the respective numbers were 15,025,812 and 38,517,975.²² For the realization of class consciousness and for class action, class community is essential, and that community in the France of 1880-95 was indeed limited.

Those contemporary persons interested in the labor movement at the time must often have been discouraged, and doubtless they frequently questioned whether anything was actually being accomplished. Looking back from 1939, however, it appears that definite progress was being made, slow and painful though the process may have been. The helplessness of the individual syndicat had soon been realized, and trade federations were created to overcome this weakness. The socialists, grasping the political possibilities of such organizations, encouraged them for all trades. Once national federations by trades had been securely established, the attempt to create a national union of all syndicats was only a question of time. The first such attempt, the National Federation of Syndicats, was a complete failure as far as accomplishment was concerned. The failure was due, however, not to the impracticability of the idea of such an organization, but rather to the faulty structural machinery which was adopted and to the unfortunate intimate connection with politics. The experience of the National Federation of Syndicats profited the bourses, and, when the latter set up their national federation in 1892, they avoided the two great weaknesses of the earlier organization and gave to the labor movement of France the features which were to be its dominant characteristics in the twentieth century.

²² *Resultats statistiques du denombrement de 1896* (Paris, 1899), pp 29-30

June, 1939

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON



VICTORIAN EVALUATION OF <i>The Ring and the Book</i>	
<i>B. R. McElderry, Jr</i> - - - - -	75
<i>The Craftsman</i> OF JULY 2, 1737, AND COLLEY CIBBER	
<i>Emmett L. Avery</i> - - - - -	91
ARMOR AND WEAPONS IN THE MIDDLE ENGLISH ROMANCES	
<i>Robert W. Ackerman</i> - - - - -	104

Pullman, Washington

RESEARCH STUDIES
of the
STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

PAUL P. KIES, *Professor of English*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CARL M. BREWSTER,
Professor of Organic Chemistry

CARL I. ERICKSON,
Associate Professor of Psychology

HERMAN J. DEUTSCH,
Associate Professor of History

RONALD F. MACLENNAN,
Associate Professor of Zoology

Entered as second-class matter December 26, 1936, at the post office at Pullman, Washington, under Act of August 24, 1912.

Research Studies of the State College of Washington is published in Pullman, Washington, by the State College of Washington. It is issued four times a year—in March, June, September, and December.

PURPOSE. *Research Studies* is established to provide a medium of publication for articles of research in the pure sciences and arts; it is limited to material making a contribution to knowledge. Its pages are open to the faculty and the advanced students of the State College of Washington.

MANUSCRIPTS. Authors who wish to publish in *Research Studies* should submit their manuscripts to Paul P. Kies, Room 305, College Hall, Pullman, Washington. Though no strict limit is set as to the maximum number of pages or the nature or number of illustrations, authors are reminded that the papers must be actual research. Long introductions, unnecessary comments, and repetitions are not acceptable. Authors who will assume the expense may arrange for the inclusion of extra pages, tables, or illustrations.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. *Research Studies* will be mailed postpaid to subscribers for two dollars a year. Subscriptions are payable in advance to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A

EXCHANGE. *Research Studies* is offered in exchange to other colleges, universities, learned societies, and libraries. Publications sent in return should be addressed to the Exchange Department, Library, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A. At present all back numbers and title pages can still be supplied.

SINGLE NUMBERS. Single numbers will be sold or exchanged as long as available, orders should be addressed to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U S A. For prices of back numbers (with the list of articles in each number), see pages 103-04 of Vol. VI and pages 119-20 of Vol. VII. The price of the present number is fifty cents.

RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Volume VII

June, 1939

Number 2

VICTORIAN EVALUATION OF *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

B. R. McELDERRY, JR.

Associate Professor of English

Browning himself regarded his magnum opus as an unqualified success. "It's admirable!" he told Allingham after the publication of Volume II. "I've ever so much more to tell."¹ When Carlyle objected to the "preposterous" construction and inquired "where . . . do ye think to find the eternal harmonies in it?"² Browning went off in a huff. Before publication he refused to furnish an extract to be included in a magazine, saying, "Out of the long twenty [thousand lines] aforesaid I honestly don't think and cannot but hope, as an artist, that not a paragraph is extractable as an episode or piece complete in itself."³ He considered the early and favorable notice in the *Athenaeum* "good,"⁴ and on April 3, 1869, a month after the fourth and final volume was published, he assured Frederick Pollock that he "had at last secured the ear of the public."⁵ In later years he advised readers to begin with his masterpiece.⁶

Recent studies,⁷ however, have shown that Browning and many of his later critics have magnified the success of *The Ring and the Book*. It was a personal rather than an artistic triumph. The reviewers of 1868-69 strove in discussing his masterpiece to make amends for Browning's long neglect. The sentimental appeal of Caponsacchi, Pompilia,

¹ William Allingham, *A Diary*, ed H. Allingham and D Radford (London, 1908), p. 195.

² *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton*, I (Boston, 1913), 325

³ Letter to E. S. Dallas in *The Letters of Robert Browning*, collected by Thomas J. Wise, ed. Thurman L. Hood (New Haven, 1933), p. 128.

⁴ Allingham, *op. cit.*, p. 195 The *Athenaeum* reviewed Volume I December 26, 1868.

⁵ *The Personal Remembrances of Sir Frederick Pollock*, II (London, 1887), p. 202.

⁶ W. H. Griffin and H. C. Minchin, *Life of Robert Browning* (New York, 1910), p. 228.

⁷ See my article, "Browning and the Victorian Public in 1868-69," *Research Studies*, V (December, 1937), 193-203. Mrs. Helen P. Pettigrew has also studied the reception of the poem, her article, "The Early Vogue of 'The Ring and the Book,'" *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CLXIX (April, 1936), 36-47, enumerates critical judgments from reviews, diaries, and letters between 1868 and 1890.

and the Pope aided the early critics to overlook or excuse the unusually frank treatment of adultery. Passing on to the more strictly artistic claims of the poem, however, the reviewers were more objective—and more sceptical. Their reasoning is still of interest on many points; taken together, the contemporary reviews represent a more thorough and illuminating analysis of *The Ring and the Book* than most subsequent critics have offered. We find comment on its form and subject matter (its aim, that is, in literary terms); on the style and elaboration; on the success of the character studies; and on the "message." As the months went by, each critic tried to say something that had not been said before, and the opinions overlap, digress, and vary in combination so as to make exact, complete summary impossible. Views on several topics, however, may be brought together so that their representativeness is beyond reasonable doubt.

First of all, there was a strong appreciation that, whatever its faults, *The Ring and the Book* was "real"; that it was, in some sense, "modern" and relative to the age. The basic appeal of the material is perhaps most clearly stated in the *North American Review* (July, 1869):

No incident in private life excites such general and prolonged interest as a murder. The first reports of the affair are eagerly read, contradictory facts and versions of facts are added every day, exaggerations, too gross for newspapers, are current in conversation and increase the popular ferment.

Whatever the testimony, some will doubt the guilt, and some the innocence of the prisoner. Let the victim be a woman, young, beautiful, and a mother, let a handsome young man be mixed up in the matter, as her friend and possible lover, let the murderer be the elderly husband, let the parties belong to high life; and let their relations be long talked about,—then are present the conditions of tragic interest.

In its review of the first volume of the poem the *Athenaeum* testified to Browning's alert use of his material.

Everywhere there is life, sense, motion—the flash of real faces, the warmth of real breath. We have glimpses of all the strange elements which went to make up Roman society of those times.⁹

There was some disappointment that the subject was Italian. "Poetry, like charity, should begin at home," grumbled the *British Quarterly Review* (March, 1869).¹⁰ *Tinsley's Magazine* (January, 1869, admonished: "If Mr. Browning had studied England and English

⁹ CIX, 281

¹⁰ No. 2148 (December 26, 1868) p. 876. By Robert Buchanan.

¹¹ XLIX, 441

character as faithfully and successfully as he has studied Italy and Italian character, his position as an English poet would have been other than it now is."¹¹ The *North British Review* (October, 1869), which felt that the subject had attracted Browning because it was Italian, comforted its readers "But if he goes to Italy and studies there, he paints Italian subjects in the Dutch manner, and is most attracted by the deposits of Teuton admixture in the strata of the Italian mind"¹²

Though set in seventeenth-century Italy, the story had been treated in a modern, even journalistic, manner. The *Saturday Review* (December 26, 1868) admitted that the poem (the first three books) had no more consecutiveness than an actual trial, and that many things were repeated:

Still, in spite of the prolongation and intricacy, the result is attained that the reader does in the end know and understand the plot, the sense of conflicting evidence, and of the different movements of the popular mind, is vividly given, and when we come to close the volume [including the first four books] we are anxious to know how the real fact will develop itself out of the maze of conjecture and inconsistency."

Writing in *Macmillan's Magazine* (January, 1869), John Addington Symonds likewise defended the plan of the poem:

We are content to peruse the facts and pleadings of the modern law-case, why should we not bring the same freshness of interest to bear upon this tragedy, not stripped, as happens in newspapers, of its poetry, but invested with all the splendours of a powerful imagination, while retaining the reality of incidents and details that bear a crime of yesterday home to the hearts of everyone."

Analyzing the whole work, however, the *British Quarterly Review* (March, 1869) was rather contemptuous of this journalistic quality.

to give eight versions of the same story, yet nowhere to tell the story in its true and direct form, is of course original, but it is certainly inartistic. It is the newspaper in blank verse."

¹¹ III, 666

¹² LI, 120. As subsequent quotations show, this was one of the ablest reviews the poem received.

¹³ XXVI, 833

¹⁴ XIX, 262. A recently published letter throws some light on this rather favorable review. Writing to Henry Sidgwick, January 13, 1869, Symonds says: "The *Ring and the Book* improves. The 2nd Vol is infinitely best. What you say about the Preface spoiling one for the rest—just as you taste some nasty thing all through the good wines and meats that succeed in a banquet—is so true that I had the greatest difficulty in trying to do my duty of faithfully appreciating the volume." *The Letters and Papers of J. A. Symonds*, ed. Horatio F. Brown (New York, 1923), p. 32.

¹⁵ XLIX, 456-57

The *North British Review* (October, 1869) was more tolerant:

Mr. Browning's poem is a cousin-german to a series of newspaper articles. His "horrid murder" is not led up to, hidden, and discovered, as in a novel, but bursts upon us like an announcement in a journal. Its interest lies not in the sensational atrocity or pathos, but in its ambiguous character,—the various interpretations which may be given to the acts and motives of the murderer, his wife, her parents, and her friend. And these are just the qualities which would make it fit material for the journalist . . . Half-Rome might be the summary of the articles and correspondence of the daily Liberal journal on the subject, "the other Half-Rome" a similar digest of a Tory paper, while the "Tertium Quid" would be the acrid and impartial distribution of universal condemnation administered by a weekly journal reviewing these perturbations of the world from a region of sweetness and light. Here the aggregates of men simply record their sentiments through the mouth of an average member."

In most of these comments there was apparent an open-mindedness and good humor which must do some credit to the literary public as well as to the reviewers themselves. Nevertheless, the parallels between the poem and a trial, or a newspaper account of one, suggested an impartiality and objectivity which many were quick to see did not exist in *The Ring and the Book*. Certainly Browning himself was omnipresent, as the *Spectator* (December 12, 1868) noted:

He overflows, as he always overflows, in intellectual point, in acute comment, in quaint illustration . . . we never lose sight of the critical eye of the poet himself, who discriminates all these different shades of thought, and tosses them off with a sharpness of outline, and sometimes a touch of intellectual caricature, often a sharp sarcasm, that could only proceed from one outside it like himself."

The *Athenaeum* (December 26, 1868) agreed:

we get Mr. Browning masquing under so many disguises, never quite hiding his identity, and generally most delicious, indeed, when the disguise is most transparent."

Again, the *British Quarterly Review* (March, 1869) said: "He throws himself with marvelous skill into many characters, but he never forgets himself."¹⁹ The *North British Review* (October, 1869) spoke of the Pope's monologue as a particularly fine example of this utterance of the poet's ideas behind the mask of his character.²⁰ Less flatteringly, *Saint*

¹⁹ LI, 117.

²⁰ XLI, 1465

²¹ No. 2148, p. 875

²² XLIX, 457

²³ LI, 123-24

Poul's (January, 1871) summed the matter up: "The speakers here differ from one another in various important respects; but they are all alike in one thing: their excessive love of talk."²¹ A brilliant wit has led astray a weak artistic conscience: that, says *Saint Poul's*, is the explanation.

Three journals accused the poet of loading the scales in favor of "the right," in spite of his protestations to the contrary. *The Spectator* (January 30, 1869) inquired: ". . . is not the truth too exclusively on one side to justify the manifold aspect in which it is the plan of the book to delineate it?"²² *The Saturday Review* (April 3, 1869) felt that Browning assumes rather than conclusively demonstrates the portentous guilt of Guido.²³ *Cornhill* (February, 1869) was much more emphatic:

It is not that the poet's own sentiments about the story and his sympathy with certain of its personages are to be detected in the workmanship, whereas they should never show at all, but that he begins by open declaration of them. . . . The dramatist should have no more judgment about the character he displays and the passion he depicts than nature herself who first created them. He should never play the commentator, still less should he take sides and explain his reasons for doing so before the play begins.²⁴

Tinsley's Magazine (January, 1869) felt that the poet "kept himself in hand" in giving various points of view regarding the events of the action.²⁵ *The Athenæum* (March 20, 1869), after attributing to Browning various Shakespearean virtues, conceded that the poem is not objective. This, however, is not a fault:

. . . it contains, even in some of its superbest passages, a certain infusion of what Mr. Matthew Arnold once called "criticism." So far from this "criticism" being a blot upon the book, it is one of the finest qualities as a modern product. The work is the more truly worthy to take Shakespearean rank because it contains certain qualities which are quite un-Shakespearean—which, in fact, reflect beautifully the latest reflections of a critical mind on mysterious modern phenomena.²⁶

Such sophistry could not prevent others from asking the question—so central in any consideration of Browning's work—why, with dramatic material and dramatic method, did he fail to produce a drama?

²¹ VII, 377. Signed "E J H."

²² XLII, 141. After the final installment the *Spectator* raised the point again, March 13, 1869 (XLII, 325).

²³ XXVII, 461.

²⁴ XIX, 254-55.

²⁵ III, 673.

²⁶ No 2160, p. 400.

Few were satisfied to say with J. A. Symonds in *Macmillan's Magazine* (January, 1869): "ours is not a dramatic age. We want to get behind the scenes."²⁷ The *Spectator* (December 12, 1868) referred to the poet as always "semi-dramatic."²⁸ The *Athenaeum* (December 26, 1868), in spite of its enthusiastic praise, admitted that "the 'monologue' even when perfectly done, can never rival the 'scene' "²⁹ The *Spectator* (March 12, 1869) indicated why: "In a story told, like this, in long semi-dramatic reaches, where the reader is closeted, as it were, with each character for a couple of hours at a stretch, there is far less room for the use of an artistic foil, than in a proper drama, where the action and reaction of the secondary characters on the principals are rapid and effective "³⁰ The *British Quarterly Review* (March, 1869) concluded that Browning is "not a dramatist, but he is a consummate actor."³¹ Less politely, *Fraser's Magazine* (November, 1869) closed its review: "So the play ends, a dramatic poem in twelve acts, which might be effectively reduced to the five of legitimate drama "³² In all these comments we are aware of a sense of disappointment, an uneasy feeling that in *The Ring and the Book* subject and form had not been ideally harmonized

Several more general remarks reflect this disappointment. "Is this indeed worth while?" inquired *Putnam's Magazine* (June, 1869); but whether worth while or not, the reviewer admitted that no one else could do it so well.³³ More caustically, the *Dublin Review* (July, 1869) averred "Few English poets, worthy of the name, that ever lived seem to have cultivated so little the *art* of poetical composition "³⁴ Some unflattering comparisons were proposed by the *North American Review*.

Nothing could be more unlike the incidents which Homer delights in than this story. If he had it to tell, he would tell it straightforwardly, in part by narration, in part by dialogue with such an interest as a healthy man takes in healthy men. Shakespeare would make out of the subject a second Othello. A didactic purpose would be absent in Homer, present but not obtruded in Shakespeare. Browning is conscious, like Lucretius, of a didactic purpose, not indeed speculative, but ethical and religious.³⁵

²⁷ XIX, 258

²⁸ XI, I, 1465

²⁹ No. 2148, p. 875

³⁰ XII, 324

³¹ XLIX, 437

³² LXXX, 678. Signed "Shirley," pseudonym of Dr. John Skelton

³³ N. S., III, 755

³⁴ LXV, 50

³⁵ CIX, 282-83

This idea that Browning had a personal bias in shaping his material, and was thus cut off from achieving the objective expression required by drama, was further supported by the *North American Review* (October, 1869). We read that Browning's discovery of the Old Yellow Book was "whimsically providential" in supplying the plot: "All that he could not do he found ready to hand; all that he could do best, he saw room for." The result is a hybrid, for the monologues are dramatic, narrative, and lyric; "the story is a good one for a man who can put together last speeches."²⁶

Most reviewers accepted the poem as a striking novelty *Cornhill* (February, 1869) remarked, "Everybody has heard by this time what the plan is of this wonderful story, and knows how original and how daring was the attempt."²⁷ This opinion was not universal. *The Nation* (February 18, 1869) refused to be amazed:

Over and over, and over again, till the crime and the revelations of the parties to it, and their own and others' opinions of it, have been looked at from every point of view, Mr Browning intends, he says, to tell the story. This, it will be seen, is but an expansion of his familiar method.²⁸

The reviewer then went on to describe "The Glove" as an example of "the familiar method." *The North American Review* (July, 1869), perhaps influenced by the *Nation*, thought that the poem, "though in scope a literary novelty, is not essentially a novelty in plan," and drew parallels between *The Ring and the Book* and "Bishop Blougram's Apology," as well as "The Glove."²⁹ *The North British Review* (October, 1869) found the new poem "both in plot and in the characters, a renewal of old productions," particularly "The Flight of the Duchess".

In both there is the child-wife, great in moral nature and in possibilities of development, but ignorant, innocent, and unformed, in both the icy, formal, heartless husband, in both the "gaunt grey nightmare" of the mother-in-law, in both a deliverer whose presence is like a flash of light to the pining wife, transfiguring her to a daring heroine. In both there is a censor who relates the story, and delivers his judgment upon the motives and acts of the persons.

The unusual length of the poem naturally invited comment, and there was little disposition to temper the winds of displeasure. Reviewing the first volume, *Macmillan's Magazine* (January, 1869) said frankly

²⁶ LI, 113-23, *passim*
²⁷ XIX, 253
²⁸ VIII, 135
²⁹ CIX, 281
³⁰ LI, 119

that it "seems to us needlessly prolix, obscure, and loaded with repetitions."⁴¹ With the completed poem at last before the public, the *Saturday Review* (April 3, 1869) decided: "The length of the poem is far too great; the form of it is clumsy, the repetitions numerous."⁴² "Too much verbiage," agreed the *Westminster Review* (April, 1869).⁴³ "A weariness to the flesh," said the *Quarterly Review* (April, 1869).⁴⁴ Reflecting on the work of Homer, Virgil, Dante, Tasso, Shakespeare, Milton, and Goethe, *Macmillan's Magazine* (April, 1869) objected: "It would be difficult to name any poem that has endured, whose length at all approaches to that of the 'Ring and the Book,' the subject of which has in itself (apart from the mode of treatment) so little comparative importance."⁴⁵ Two years after the publication of the first installment of the poem, *Saint Paul's* (January, 1871) concluded: "There is too much of everything in it . . . Art's first office, selection, has been here very imperfectly discharged."⁴⁶

There was little defense, but there was some. John Morley (*Fortnightly*, March 1, 1869) was rather condescending to those who thought the poem too long.⁴⁷ And the reviewer for the *Christian Examiner* (May, 1869) showed himself a very prodigy of enthusiasm: "It would be easy to enumerate various faults, but the length of the poem would not be among them. For ourselves *we wish it was longer*" (italics mine). This unique desire was justified as follows

There seems to be no good reason why a poet should not have as much space as a novelist if he can sustain an interest. And this Browning does to perfection. Once launched upon the current we are swept along at an almost furious rate.⁴⁸

A more cogent though only partial defense was the shrewd analysis in *Fraser's Magazine* (November, 1869). The writer admits that the

⁴¹ XIX, 262.

⁴² XXVII, 461

⁴³ XCI, 578

⁴⁴ CXXXVI, 347

⁴⁵ XIX, 544 This second *Macmillan's* article was by J. R. Mozley, not by Symonds

⁴⁶ VII, 377

⁴⁷ *Fortnightly*, N S, V, 333. Though Morley reprinted this review practically unchanged, *Studies in Literature* (London, 1907), pp. 255-85, it does not represent his final judgment of the poem. In his *Recollections* (London 1917), I, 132-33, we find the following comment: "Say what we will of *The Ring and the Book*, its dubious aesthetic, its strain on language and even grammar, the absence from a good half of its pages of music, *its impossible length* [italics mine], yet its intellectual moral is lighted up with an intensity of dramatic force that is hardly surpassed in literature."

⁴⁸ LXXXVI, 311. By J. W. Chadwick

poem, though suitable for the age of Methusaleh, "is far too big for the nineteenth century."

Yet *The Ring and the Book* is an interesting, as well as a great book; spite of its size . . . it does not weary the reader. I venture to think, however, that it would make a far more permanently powerful impression on the mind if the four volumes were condensed to two. It is difficult to say, indeed, how this is to be done without losing much which we should wish to keep. It is quite plain that, under the conditions which we have described, monotony has only been avoided by the exercise of really consummate art.⁶⁰

The art consists, we are told, in reproducing the effect of a trial, where the argument ebbs and flows, disclosing "the speaker's individual idiosyncrasy" and allowing each speaker to enlarge

on one particular episode, which is not mentioned, except in passing, by the others. This episode is in each case that which appears to justify the speaker's conduct, or is otherwise specifically interesting to him. The flight from Arezzo to Rome, for instance, which is barely mentioned by Guido, is fully detailed by Caponsacchi.⁶¹

This is an important critical perception, easily verifiable from any reader's experience with the poem. Though not specifically formulated by other reviewers of the poem, it is the real explanation of why the condemnation of the poem's length was not far greater, even, than it was.

If the poem was thus by common consent much too long, what should have been left out? The lawyers were an obvious target, and several journals objected to the elaborate treatment given them. *Macmillan's Magazine* (April, 1869) found "the dissertations of the lawyers . . . such as scarcely anyone would choose to read over a second time."⁶² "They only weary us by their futility," said *Chambers Journal* (July 24, 1869).⁶³ Only one critic defended these two books. *Fraser's Magazine* (November, 1869) spoke second thought instead of first impression:

I have heard it said that an approach to farce at this point—immediately after the beautiful words last quoted [from Pompilia]—must be out of place. I do not feel it to be so. Shakespeare I think would have seen that it was eminently fitting that a criminal trial should take the usual course through the courts, should fall into the hands of Dominus Hyacinthus de Archangelis, and his learned brother . . .⁶⁴

⁶⁰ LXXX, 673-74.

⁶¹ XIX, p. 550.

⁶² XLVI, 474. See also *Saturday Review*, XXVII (April 3, 1869), 460, *Electric Magazine*, N S, IX (May, 1869), 633; *Saint Paul's*, VII (January, 1871), 377.

⁶³ LXXX, 677.

This critic would rather have seen omitted "Half-Rome," "The Other Half-Rome," and "Tertium Quid," though they are "extremely clever." *Macmillan's Magazine* (April, 1869) objected to "Tertium Quid" as well as to the two books on the lawyers, and to "The Pope."⁸³ The *Athenaeum* (March 20, 1869) felt that Guido's second speech could have been dispensed with "on account of its extreme and discordant pain. Yet in Guido's speech occurs one of the noblest touches in the whole work"—the concluding appeal to Pompilia.⁸⁴ In all this there seems to be less conviction regarding any individual book than a troubled feeling that by selection and compression the poet might have used his material to better advantage. The attitude of the *Westminster Review* (April, 1869) toward the books on the lawyers is perhaps representative: "To say that there are some beauties in them is to say nothing at all. We expect something more from Mr. Browning."⁸⁵

Like the sheer length of the poem, the style, too, was sharply criticized. The *Athenaeum* (December 26, 1868) thought Browning's manner "that of a magpie"⁸⁶; the *British Quarterly Review* (March, 1869) lamented "power defiant of Art, and original thought hidden in difficult language"⁸⁷; and there were numerous incidental references to his obscurity. The *Spectator* (December 12, 1868) detailed the familiar faults of over-condensation, syntax, coinages, and parentheses.⁸⁸ Browning is, of course, easily vulnerable to such attacks. The notable thing in the reception of *The Ring and the Book* is the vigorous defense put forward by several critics. The *North British Review* (December, 1868) introduced its discussion by an analysis of Wordsworth's two simplicities, that of the lyric and that of his blank verse. Browning, the critic insisted, rejected both, one as too bald, the other as too inflated. Instead, he strove for "a natural flow that shall ascend into the rising inflection, rather than fall, as is so common in the lyrics of Wordsworth, into the namby-pamby clench of the falling inflection." Browning's blank verse this critic found "singularly pure," as "affected simplicity and affected complexity" were alike avoided.⁸⁹ The *Westminster Review* (January, 1869) professed to see in *The Ring and the Book* great improvement over his earlier work.

⁸³ XIX, 550-51

⁸⁴ No. 2160, p. 400

⁸⁵ XCI, 577

⁸⁶ No. 2148, p. 875

⁸⁷ XLIX, 458

⁸⁸ XLI, 1465

⁸⁹ XI.IX, 376-77

In the *Ring* and the *Book* we so far meet fewer of those wilful extravagances, crabbedness verging to obscurity, and carelessness of expression, which looks like contempt for the reader. The blank verse, too, has a sustained roll and harmony. There is less of that ruggedness of expression which in Mr. Browning's earliest poems so marred the form of the thought. We are constantly surprised by lines of excellent grace.¹⁰

The *Christian Examiner* (May, 1869) denied at once that the new poem was obscure; objecting to the charge of "Browningese," the reviewer pointed out that Browning—unlike Swinburne, with his predilection for "sweet" and other words—has no pet vocabulary.¹¹ *Saint Paul's* (January, 1871) found Browning a "master of dramatic blank verse"; in spite of the occasional piling up of consonants there is beautiful harmony and variation in the meter; and there is "magnificence" in many of the similes.¹² Less a defense and more an explanation of the style was the comment of the *North British Review* (October, 1869):

He must be read running, and read with the eye more than with the ear. To read him aloud, or to let the ear pore over his verse is mortal. But to the intelligence he repays minute study. He presents a boundless chaos of accidental knowledge.¹³

It is, of course, impossible to say how genuine this apology for Browning's style was. Part of the defense, no doubt, may be set down as rationalizing by those who on other grounds had come to admire Browning, and naturally wished to clear away the reputation for obscurity which was so serious a barrier to his larger popularity. It is notable, too, that some of the favorable comment, though not all, came early and not after the whole poem was available. And, no matter what explanations could be made in behalf of the style, there were many critics who wished it had been better. Some reviewers specifically regretted Browning's failure to include more passages of lyrical quality.¹⁴

Thus, point by point, there was a division of opinion on the merits of the general design and treatment of the poem. The poem was real, but if Browning had chosen a subject less remote and then treated it more objectively, the result might have been more satisfying. The effect was frequently dramatic, but having approached the drama so nearly, it was a pity that Browning had not in truth become the Victorian

¹⁰ XCI, 299.

¹¹ LXXXVI, 295, 312.

¹² VII, 394-95.

¹³ LI, 125.

¹⁴ *Athenaeum*, No. 2148 (December 26, 1868), p. 876, *Saint James Magazine*, N S., II (December, 1868), 462, *Macmillan's Magazine*, XIX (January, 1869), 258.

Shakespeare. *The Ring and the Book* was "different," novel, but perhaps only on the surface after all. The length, in spite of the interest, and the style, in spite of its vigor, seemed perverse. Most of these misgivings were pronounced or hinted in respectful tones, and mingled with much compliment in the conventional idiom of the day. Yet to say that "the weightier reviews . . . were practically unanimous in their approval"⁶⁶ of the poem is grossly misleading. The careful reader finds admiration joined with genuine disappointment: with his undoubted genius, and his tremendous activity, Mr. Browning might have done more for Victorian literature.

The characters, it is true, were almost universally admired. As I have shown in a previous article,⁶⁶ this was partly because of their sentimental appeal. In a general way, the "message" of the poem was similarly attractive. The *Spectator* (January 30, 1869) emphasized Browning's illustration of the power of love:

Mr. Browning's picture of this passionate human love stirring in the heart of a fashionable, frivolous, and dissipated, but still noble, unspoiled nature, and awakening it at one and the same time to the holiness of the priest's desecrated faith and calling, and to the unearthly beauty of her whom he could not but half-love with earthly rapture and half-adore with a worship very like the true Catholic cultus of the Madonna, is to our minds the finest effort of the author's genius.⁶⁷

Putnam's Magazine (March, 1869) stated as a broader implication of the poem that

where violence is done to natural instincts . . . a reparation of sudden crime and tragedy will follow,—or else the deadly withering and freezing of human hearts.⁶⁸

In contrast were the coolly critical inferences of the *North British Review* (October, 1869): "The very first doctrine to the lyric-philosopher is love at first sight." The obverse of the true morality is to be found in Guido:

Guido is Mr. Browning's Iago, in him we have his ideal of wickedness. Guido is not a man of strong passions, urged by his nature to vice. He is, on the contrary, an artificial man, one whose hinges turn not on the pivot of passion, but on that of reason. He is a walking example of Rousseau's aphorism, "L'homme qui raisonne est un animal depravé." His master-passion is a made-up one, the love of money, which, in common with the mediaeval

⁶⁶ Griffin and Minchin, *op. cit.*, p. 240

⁶⁷ Cited in note 7. See particularly pp. 200-03.

⁶⁸ XLII, 140

⁶⁹ *Putnam's Magazine*, N S., III, 371

moralists, Mr Browning considers the least human and most diabolical of all, because it is simply artificial. Add to him pride, not the natural pride of his far-reaching intelligence, or any other natural gift, but the pride of station, another artificial passion, and we have reason for the cruel vengeance, the "lust and letch of hate" which he exhibits.

Pompilia and Caponsacchi are then described as "lyrical characters wafted over the wild waters of life by the breezes of good feeling and the gales of passionate instinct."⁹

These comments, pro and con, would of course be applicable to Browning's work as a whole. What he specifically set himself to add through *The Ring and the Book* was a doctrine regarding the human perception of truth. John Morley (*Fortnightly*, March 1, 1869) summed it up thus:

The whole poem is a parable of the feeble and half-hopeless struggle which truth has to make against the ways of the world. That in this particular case truth and justice did win some pale sort of victory does not weaken the force of the lesson. The victory was such and so won as to stir in us awful thoughts of fatal risks and certain defeats, of falsehood a thousand times clasped for truth, of fact a thousand times banished for fancy.¹⁰

This posing of the difficulties of truth in the world is carried to a climax in the treatment of the Pope, here Morley found at its best Browning's courageous facing of reality. *The Christian Examiner* (May, 1869) reduced the point to simpler and more serviceable terms: "Never was dogmatism rebuked more sternly. Never was charity more bravely taught."¹¹ *The North American Review* (July, 1869) expressed, less hopefully, the same idea as represented in the words of the poem itself: "the cause of 'The Ring and the Book' is a moral and religious lesson,—

This lesson, that our human speech is naught,
Our human testimony false, our fame
And human estimation, words and wind."¹²

What then of Browning's vaunted intention to fashion truth from the Old Yellow Book, even as the smith by using art and alloy fashions the ring from "slivers of pure gold"? Oddly enough, few reviewers paid much attention to the idea. *The Saturday Review* (December 26, 1868) referred to the opening passage of the poem as an example of Browning's tendency to strain a metaphor too far, perhaps a natural

⁹ LI, 113, 121-22

¹⁰ N S, V, 339

¹¹ LXXXVI, 314

¹² CIX, 283. The passage is from Book XII, 11 834-36

conclusion when the reader had only three books of the poem before him."³³ Six months later the *North American Review* (July, 1869) inquired, "Had ever poem a lovelier name?"³⁴ But it was ornament, not symbolism, that was admired. The *North British Review* (October, 1869), however, gave careful thought to the claims represented in the symbol.

The gold is the dead matter of the poem, the alloy is the "surplusage of soul," which the poet projects into the dead matter to make it malleable; the embossing and shaping is the poetic form; the spirit of acid by which the alloy is washed away is some final act of the poet, by which he removes all traces of himself and leaves the poem quite impersonal. This Mr. Browning claims to have done. But the reader, who will see that each speaker in these idyls talks unmistakable Browningsese, that, however varied the character, the turns of thought and expression always remain similar, will justifiably wonder what spirit it is which has caused that which was only just now alloy suddenly to have become pure unalloyed gold. A great artist will make the alloy entirely impersonal, and will allow it to contain none of the elements of his own biography. But whatever the poet first contributes remains in the perfect poem, unless he writes it all over again. There are not two distinct acts—first of infusing surplusage of soul, and next of washing it away. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Browning seems, of set purpose, to let an element of incompleteness, or even error, remain in his similes.³⁵

It is interesting that this reviewer found the book on the Pope "perhaps the most satisfactory" (p. 123), though this is precisely the section in which he points out the most obvious "surplusage of soul." That is to say, the critic accepted Browning's performance but not his theory. Other British and American critics seem not to have taken the theory seriously enough to argue its validity. The point was vigorously argued against Browning, however, in the interesting French review by Louis Etienne (*Revue de deux mondes*, February 1, 1870). Admitting the vividness of *The Ring and the Book*, its psychological and ethical interest, M. Etienne believes that the peculiar form has complicated the poem and encouraged the natural tendency of the author to prolixity. The use of old materials is legitimate, even brilliant. But Browning thinks he has attained to the pure gold, that is to say to reality. The analogy of the ring is in fact an illusion. Where is the acid which disengages from his work the poetical fiction? If he had found it, he would simply have dissolved the poem. When one would search for the truth he must always lay aside the ring and return to the book. If the poet omitted this misleading thesis that poetry can come at the historical truth better than judges, witnesses, and history itself, the real drama of

³³ XXVI, 834

³⁴ LXXXVI, 279

³⁵ I T 105 26

the poem would remain. Browning has created Saul, Pompilia, and a multitude of other personages true and living; what advantage is there in this new ambition? In following it he has made his poem long, prolix, and heavy.⁷⁶

Thus Browning's specific doctrine found even less acceptance than his artistic method and judgment. It was the characters of the poem, and the broad moral lessons inherent in their experience, which the reviewers most whole-heartedly admired. In the characters and through them was observable the poet's own vigorous faith that reality was somehow good and true and beautiful. The times needed courage, and Browning seemed to have it. The reviewers admired his pluck in outlasting neglect. They saw steadfastness in his achievement of a huge masterpiece in the years immediately following his bereavement. *The Edinburgh Review* (July, 1869) ranked Browning with those poets "not vanquished by life"—with Shakespeare, Goethe, and Tennyson (who are contrasted with Shelley, Byron, Heine, and Carlyle). Speaking of the Pope's confronting of his doubts and disappointments, the reviewer drew a parallel:

This is the true felicity of men—to hear, amid the din and direful spectacle of the battle, the sage servant of God and soldier of humanity proclaim, not in any cry of ecstatic hope, but in the calm clear voice of conviction, his faith in the victory to come

No,—I have light nor fear the dark at all [R B, X, 1659]

This is what we meant when we said that Mr Browning was distinguished by the serenity of his intellect, when we called him a valiant soldier of humanity, when we numbered him among those who, if they have not vanquished, have at least not been vanquished by the problem of human nature.⁷⁷ Such a tribute—and there were many—registers a personal triumph rather than an artistic one. In the very enthusiasm of the reviewers there was not so much a confidence that the intelligent reading public would enjoy *The Ring and the Book*, as a conviction that because "Beauty has come with edification in her train,"⁷⁸ they ought to enjoy it, regardless of the inconvenience. The psychology which in 1881 resulted in the formation of the Browning Society was already well developed.

⁷⁶ LXXXV, 733-35. This review, entitled "Une nouvelle forme de poëse dramatique," is a general estimate of Browning based upon the 1868 collection of his works as well as the newer poem. After a leisurely and intelligent discussion of Browning's relation to the English public, his indebtedness to Shelley, his psychological interest, and his early poems, of which "Saul," "Fra Lippo Lippi," and "Andrea del Sarto" are discussed as typical, the reviewer turns to *The Ring and the Book*. There is a long sympathetic analysis of Pompilia's speech, through which the essence of the story is made clear, the passage summarized above follows.

⁷⁷ CXXX, 182.

⁷⁸ *Edinburgh Review*, XXXII (July 1869) 340.

THE CRAFTSMAN OF JULY 2, 1737, and COLLEY CIBBER

EMMETT L. AVERY

Assistant Professor of English

The Licensing Act of 1737 had a variety of consequences, great and small, upon the theatrical world of London, but there was one controversy, both political and literary in nature, which has not been particularly noticed before and in which the name of Colley Cibber was involved. The incident occurred during a quarrel between two newspapers—a controversy which had become heightened during the latter part of May and most of June, 1737, when the Act was in the process of being pushed through Parliament. Most of the quarrel was political, as was a great deal of the controversy over the Act, the *Daily Gazetteer*, a Government organ, gave over a number of issues in June to a determined defense of the bill, and the *Country Journal, or Craftsman*, an Opposition paper edited by Caleb D'Anvers, just as vigorously attacked it. Even the passage of the Act did not still the tumult of *Gazetteer* versus *Craftsman*.

So far as the *Craftsman* was concerned, however, its polemics came to an unexpected climax with the issue of July 2, 1737 (No. 574), which contained a long letter purporting to be by Colley Cibber, since it was signed "C C P L." (Colley Cibber, Poet Laureate). The letter, addressed to Caleb D'Anvers, suggests that, although the *Craftsman* was opposed to the Licensing Act, perhaps it would be interested in seeing the Act, now passed, made genuinely effective. In order to make it valuable, the writer says, the authorities must supervise old plays as well as new because there are passages in earlier plays which may be given a political implication in later revivals, the author further proposes that no one is better suited for the office of examiner of the plays than he is. The letter, which follows,¹ is a detailed statement of the case (the first paragraph being the editor's comment):

To give the World a manifest Proof of my Impartiality, upon all Occasions, I will print a Letter, which I have lately received from a new Correspondent, though at the same Time I own that the *Pertness*, as well as *Familiarity of the Style*, gives me some Offence, but I presume it may be the peculiar Manner of the *Author*, and as such I will pass it over for the present

¹ Because files of the *Craftsman* in the original state are rare, it seems advisable to reprint the entire letter.

To CALEB D'ANVERS, Esq;

Dear Caleb,

Quod fieri non debet, factum valet, is the Saying of some old Craftsman, and as it is a very wise Maxim, I shall venture to write to Thee upon it. I was in Hopes that tho' You were against the *Bill, for Licensing the Stage*, You would be for making it effectual, now it is pass'd into a *Law* I take Thee to be no *Jacobite*, though a damn'd morose Prig of a *Patriot*, but thy Papers being read, when our *Gazetters* are never heard of, give me leave to make them the Vehicle of some Observations I have set down for the *Licensor's* Use A Person of his Rank, though He delighted never so much in reading, cannot be presumed to have Leisure enough for so tedious an Employment, and I would willingly shew him how proper I am for the Business, having, by my former Vocation, several Plays by Heart, and tho' I say it, that should not say it, the best Judge in *England* of all *dramatical Performances*

I write to You, upon this Occasion, with the more Freedom, because You were formerly pleased to recommend Me as a proper Supervisor of all Plays, old and new, and to make an *Index expurgatorius* of such Passages as are not now fit to be brought upon the Stage I have taken thy Hint, and set my mark upon a Multitude of Passages in Plays now in Being, which will be proper to be left out in all future Representations of them. For Method's Sake I have put them under several Heads, as they regards *Politicks, Divinity, or Bawdry* The first of these shall be chiefly my Province; and if I might presume to recommend a fit Person to take care of the *other two Heads*, I would name Mr Orator H---y, not only as He is undoubtedly orthodox, and of a sound Character in every other Respect, but likewise because He may at present be an Object of *Charity*, since the *Oratory* itself may come under the Description of the *Act*, which takes in all *Interludes*, where Money is given at the Door.

The Passages I have already collected upon this Head of *Politicks*, which I have undertaken, are so very numerous, that I can only give You a little Specimen of them at present, with relation to *Kings, Queens, Princes, and Ministers of State*.

I shall begin with *The Life and Death of King JOHN*, which I had alter'd from *Shakespeare*, though the Town was so unreasonably prejudiced against Me, that They almost unanimously combined against its Representation, and I am Sorry to say, *Caleb*, that Thou wast in the

Number. But I doubt not to convince Thee, by a few Passages from it, that it ought not to be acted at present, without an *Alteration*, though Mr. R--h hath had the Presumption to do it, after mine was rejected.

In the first Place, it is to be observed, that King *John* is represented through the whole Play as an *Usurper*, who seized and kept the *Crown*, in Prejudice to his elder Brother *Geoffrey's* Son, *Arthur*, who was then abroad and supported by the Court of *France* This young Prince's Mother, *Constance*, is drawn as a Woman of great Spirit, and *Shakespeare* hath put several Speeches in her Mouth, which are capable of very bad Applications; particularly the following.

*When Law can do no Right,
Let it be lawful that Law barr no Wrong.
Law cannot give my Child his Kingdom here;
For He, that holds his Kingdom, holds the Law.
Therefore since Law itself is perfect Wrong,
How can the Law forbid my Tongue to curse?*

This is a downright Assertion that *England* was then under a *Parliamentary Tyranny*, or *legal Slavery*; and as you Malcontents are charged with hinting at something of the same Nature at present, I left out the whole Passage, in my *Alteration of this Play*

King *John* having intirely lost the Affections of his People, Cardinal *Pandulph*, the *Pope's* Legate, encourages the *Dolphin* of *France* to invade *England*, in the following Terms, which I had likewise omitted.

*If but a dozen French
Were there in Arms, They would be as a Call
To train ten thousand English to their Side;
Or as a little Snow, tumbled about,
Anon becomes a Mountain—O noble Dolphin,
Go with me to thet King; 'tis wonderful
What may be wrought out of their Discontent,
Now that their Souls are topful of Offence.*

When the King heard of the *Dolphin's* being landed with a Body of Forces, He speaks thus to *Hubert*, whom He had ordered to murder Prince *Arthur*

*It is the Curse of Kings, to be attended
By Slaves, that take their Humours for a Warrant*

† The King of France

*And on the winking of Authority,
To understand a Law; to know the Meaning
Of dangerous Majesty, when perchance it frowns
More upon Humour than advis'd Respect.*

How this may be apply'd I leave You and the Reader to judge, as well as the following Passage in the same Play, where the *King* conjures the *Cardinal Legate* to make Use of his Authority against the *French*, who were then advancing against Him.

*Our discontented Counties do revolt;
Our People quarrel with Obedience,
Swearing allegiance and the Love of Soul
To stranger-Blood, to foreign Royalty.
This Inundation of mistemper'd Humour
Rests by You only to be qualify'd.
Then pause not; for the present Time's so sick,
That present Medicine must be minister'd,
Or Overthrow incurable ensues*

This Play concludes with the Death of the *King*; who, being obliged to leave the Field, retired to *Swineshead* Abbey, where He was supposed to be poison'd by a Monk; upon which the discontented Lords deserted the *French*, and join'd with Prince *Henry*, their new Sovereign, in the Defense of their Country, which his *Father* had brought to the very Brink of Destruction.---Dost not Thou think, *Caleb*, that this Moral requires a different Turn; or that very invidious Constructions may be put upon it, as it stands at present? I took Care to prevent all these in my Alteration; but as the world was not pleased with it, *Modesty* obliges me to be silent, upon that Head.

The next play, that falls under my Consideration, is *the Life and Death of King Richard the 2d*, written by the same Author; which hath not been acted within my Memory, and I think never ought, without considerable Castrations and Amendments; for it not only represents an *obstinate, misguided Prince* deposed by his *People*, which is agreeable enough to the Principles of the *Revolution*; but likewise contains several Passages, which the *disaffected* may turn to their Account.—I will mention only two or three.

The *King*, speaking of the Duke of *Hereford* (his Successor, by the Name of *Henry the 4th*) makes the following Reflection upon his *Popularity*.

—Bagot and Greene

*Observ'd his Courtship to the common People;
How He did seem to dive into their Hearts,
With humble and familiar courtesie;
What Reverence He did throw away on Slaves,
Wooing poor Craftsmen with the Craft of Souls,
And patient under-bearing of his Fortune*

It is to be observed that the *King* had used the *Duke of Hereford* very ill; and though He was neither his *Son*, nor his *lawful Heir*, malicious People may apply it to *Princes* between whom there is a much nearer Relation I need say no more; but shall leave it to your Judgment whether this Passage ought not to be expunged, as well as the whole first Scene of the second Act; particularly where *John of Gaunt*, Duke of *Lancaster*, foretells the Fate of the King, his Nephew, just before his Death. As you formerly quoted this propheticall Speech in one of your Papers, I shall repeat only the Conclusion of it.

*This Land of such dear Souls, this dear-dear Land,
Dear for her Reputation through the World,
Is new leas'd out, (I dye pronouncing it)
Like to a Tenement, or pelting Farm
England, bound in with the triumphant Sea,
Whose rocky Shore beats back the envious Siege,
Of watery Neptune, is bound in with Shame,
With INKY BLOTS, and ROTTEN PARCHMENT
BONDS.*

*That England, that was wont to conquer others
Hath made a shameful Conquest of itself*

This is such a general Reflection upon my *dear Country*, and the whole Mystery of *Treaty-making*, that I think it ought not to be suffer'd to appear, even in *Print*, much less to be pronounced on the *Stage*.

In another Part of the same Scene, *old Gaunt* addresses the *King*, in this licentious Manner, which will likewise admit of very bad Constructions.

*Thy Deathbed is no lesser than the Land,
Whercin Thou lyest in Reputation sick,
And Thou too careless, patient as Thou art,
Commit'st thy anointed Body to the Cure
Of those Physicians, that first wounded Thee;*

*A thousand Flatterers sit within thy Crown,
Whose Compass is no bigger than thy Hand,
And yet incag'd in so small a Verge,
The Waste is no whit lesser than thy Land.*

At the latter End of this Scene, the following Dialogue passes between *Northumberland*, *Willoughby* and *Ross*; which is more intolerable than all the rest.

Nor The King is not Himself, but basely led
By Flatterers, and what They will inform
Meerly in Hate 'gainst any of us all,
That will the King severely prosecute
'Gainst us, our Lives, our Children and our Heirs.

Ross The Commons hath He pull'd with grievous Taxes,
And quite lost their Hearts The Nobles hath He fin'd
For antient Quarrels, and quite lost their Hearts.

Will. And daily new Exactions are devis'd,
But what O'God's Name doth become of this?

Nor. Wars have not wasted it; for warr'd He hath not,
But basely yielded upon Compromise
That, which his Ancestors achiev'd with Blows
More hath He spent in Peace than They in Wars

This wants no Comment, and therefore I shall proceed to the *Second Part of Henry the 4th*, which was likewise written by *Shakespeare*. Every Body knows that *this Prince* mounted the Throne, upon the Deposition of *Richard the 2d*, by the Assistance and with the general Approbation of the *People*, but He soon lost the Hearts of his best Friends, the Earl of *Northumberland*, *Worcester*, and *Harry Percy*, who were principally instrumental in advancing Him to the Throne, by neglecting their Services, and provoked Them to take up Arms against Him. As They were very popular Lords, many others join'd with Them; and amongst the rest, the *Archbishop of York*, who encourages Them with Hopes of Success by the following Observation:

*The Commonwealth is sick of their own Choice,
Their over-greedy Love hath surfeited*

The *Jacobites* may take Occasion from hence to suggest, I dare not say what, and point it out to the Notice of the Audience by *Clapping*, which one of my *honourable Friends* hath lately proved to be a

very seditious and almost treasonable Practice.—Let this Passage therefore be expunged, as well as several others in both *Parts of the same Play*, which I have mark'd down in my *Index expurgatorius*.

You have already observed that *Ben Johnson's* SEJANUS and Sir *John Denham's* SOPHY have not been acted these many Years. The *Fall of MORTIMER* was lately prohibited, after it had run several Nights; and there are many other Plays, which require the same *una Litura*, or at least very large Expurgations; such as the tragical Part of the *Spanish Fryer*, *Don Sebastian*, and even *Cato* itself, which abound with insufferable Reflections upon *Kings, Queens, Favourites, and wicked Men in Power*

I do not remember that *All for Love, or the World well lost*, hath been acted at either House for a Year or two past; and I hope the present worthy Managers of our Theatres will have the prudence not to bring it on again, for some Time, or to suppress the following Passages. The first is where *Ventidius* speaks thus to *Alexas*, concerning *Anthony's* unseasonable and ridiculous Fondness for a foreign Mistress.

*I tell Thee, Eunuch, She hath quite unman'd Him.
Can any Roman see, and know Him now,
Thus alter'd from the Lord of half Mankind,
Unbent, unsinew'd, made a Woman's Toy,
Shrunk from the vast Extent of all His Honours,
And cramp'd within a Corner of the World?*

Who knows how This may be apply'd; or whether our *factions Patriots* may not lay the Scene in some other Corner of the World, besides *AEgypt*?—This Subject is farther pursued in several Parts of the same Play; particularly in the third Act, by *Ventidius* and *Dolabella*; the latter of whom *Anthony* reproaches with his former Passion for *Cleopatra*; upon which *Dolabella* replies thus.

*Dola And should my Weakness be a Plea for yours?
Mine was an Age, when Love might be excused,
When kindly Warmth, and when my springing Youth
Made it a Debt to Nature, Yours----*

*Vent ---- speak boldly.
Yours, He would say, in your declining Age,
When no more Heat was left but what was forced;
When all the Sap was needful for the Trunk,
When it went down, then You constrain'd the Course,*

*And robb'd from Nature to supply Desire.
In You (I would not use so harsh a Word)
'Tis but plain Dotage.*

I will not pretend to say that Mr. Dryden prophetically intended any Reflection, upon the *present Times*, in this Dialogue: but that it may be construed in such a Sense by Those, who are so much addicted to *Parallels* and *Applications*, I believe nobody will deny; and therefore it ought to be suppress'd.

There are several Passages, to the same Purpose, in *Lee's Alexander*, or the *Rival Queens*; but I shall instance only the following. The *Queen Consort* speaks it.

*Stat. Roxana then enjoys my perjured Love;
Roxana clasps my Monarch in her Arms,
Doats on my Conqueror, my dear Lord, my King*

As to *Ministers of State*, especially *Prime-Ministers*, all our modern Plays are so full of Satire upon them, that it would require Volumes to make Extracts from them at large. I shall therefore mention only one; I mean the Tragedy of Sir *Walter Raleigh*; which, besides the general Reflection upon our Country, for being tamely bully'd and insulted by *Spain*, is stuff'd with the grossest and most virulent Aspersions upon *great Men*, who have the Happiness to get at the Height of Power and Favour with their Prince.—*Carew*, a Friend of Sir *Raleigh*, inveighs against the *Corruption* of those times, in the following Manner.

*Car. That Gold, believe me, Sir, is well employ'd
It works like Poison through our weaken'd State
Infects our generous pure Forefathers Blood,
And fits our free-born Souls for foreign Yokes.
How many noble Structures could I name,
What sumptuous Villa's, labour'd up to Heaven,
Enrich'd with figured Silk, and stiff with Gold,
But not one Tale in all the Pile to say,
"These are the Monuments of perjured Faith,
"The high-raised Spoils of mercenary Greatness?*

Lord *Cobham* speaks to the same Effect; and though He is represented mad, there seems to be very good Sense in what he says, however liable to bad Interpretations. I will only give you a short Specimen of it.

*Cob. O. what a Mine of Mischief is a Statesman!
 Ye furious Whirlwinds, and ye treacherous Rocks,
 Ye ministers of Death, devouring Fire,
 Convulsive Earthquake, and Plague-tainted Air,
 All You are merciful, and mild to Him,
 The passive Instruments of righteous Heaven,
 But He, for Goodness form'd, and placed to bless,
 Wilful opposes Providence in Spight,
 And is a DEVIL of his own Formation.*

The dying Advice, which Sir Walter Raleigh gives to his Son, savours likewise of the same malevolent Spirit, as you will perceive by the following Lines

*Ral Contract no Friendship with an o'ergrown Greatness;
 Falling, it crushes Thee, and standing long,
 Grows insolently weary of Support,
 And spurns the Props, that held it up before.*

It is needless to quote any more after This; and besides my letter is already grown too long. The only Design of it is to shew that the *late Act, for restraining the Stage*, will not answer the Purpose intended by it, unless there be some Regulation of *old Plays*, as well as *new ones*; and that Nobody, without Vanity, is fitter for this Office than *Myself*. It will be a pretty Augmentation to *That*, which I now enjoy; and, indeed, I have already distinguish'd myself in so remarkable a Manner, by gutting *other People's Works*, that I am in no great Doubt of succeeding. I can only add, that if *his Grace* should be pleased to bestow *this Employment* upon Me, I will execute it, with great Industry, to the Confusion of all *Papists, Jacobites, Incenduraries, and Patriots*

*I am thine,
 as far as becomes me,
 C C P.L.*

Before the authorship of the letter is considered, it may be well to notice the results of its appearing in the *Craftsman*. The principal one was the taking into custody of the printer of that journal.³ In a later issue, as reported in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the editor of the *Craftsman* told what happened to him following the appearance of the letter:

³ See *Gentleman's Magazine*, VII (July, 1737), 430

The Public, says Mr. *D'Anvers*, cannot be Strangers to y^e extraordinary Measures taken against *this Paper*. The Publication was not only stop'd for a Week, and several Persons taken up and detained an *unusual Time* in Custody without being examined, but the *Shop-Books* and other *Accounts*, nay even the *Advertisements* for the Week were likewise seized, and the *House* where the Paper was printed, shut up by the Messengers.*

For the *Daily Gazetteer* the letter of "C.C.P.L." proved to be a golden opportunity. In its issue of July 7, 1937, it made the most of what it termed the libelous qualities of the letter. In doing so, it to some extent misrepresented the professed purpose of the letter, for, instead of considering that its author merely suggested that audiences might construe the passages quoted from Shakespeare and other authors into reflections upon ministers and rulers, the *Daily Gazetteer* took the point of view that the letter was deliberately making the quotations applicable to the contemporary ministers and King. As the *Daily Gazetteer* said:

and so thro' the whole Paper, he takes care to give the Reader very strong Intimations of his Meaning, to avoid any Possibility of a Mistake, and indeed I believe no one can be so dull as not very perfectly to understand him

Elsewhere in the same issue the *Daily Gazetteer* used stronger language in attacking the purpose of the *Craftsman*.

THIS Age has abounded with Writings of this Sort, but certainly of all the Libels that ever polluted the Press none ever equalled the *Craftsman* of last *Saturday*. The furious Zeal of that Writer has, upon many Occasions, carried him very extraordinary Lengths before, but in that Paper he has broke thro' all the Bounds of Decency, and has exceeded every thing that could be imagined, even from him

NOTHING therefore can be more evident, if the Writer's own Word may be taken for it, than, that this Paper is the greatest Insult and most notorious Abuse that was ever offer'd to the Supreme Power of a chief Magistrate of and Country, in any Age or Nation

Sometime later, on August 6, the *Craftsman* attempted to put the motives of the letter in its issue of July 2 in their true light. It was an attempt to vindicate both the editor and the author of the letter:

I appeal to any Man of common Sense and Candour, whether the natural and obvious Design of that Paper was not to shew that several *old Plays* are capable of as bad Applications as any *new ones* can be. For this Purpose, several Passages are quoted out of old Plays, with Relation to *Kings, Queens, Ministers of State*, which it is said *malicious People* may apply in a bad Sense, but the

* *Craftsman*, No 576, July 27, as quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, VII (July, 1737), 437-38.

Author of that Paper makes no Application of them himself, and only recommended them to the Care of the *Licensor*, or his *Deputy*. I hope, for the Honour of our Country, which hath long boasted of its *Freedom*, that a few Quotations out of *old Plays*, in order to illustrate this Point, cannot be deemed criminal in Law.

The discussion in the two papers did not end there, but nothing new was injected into the controversy.

In all the argument which grew out of the letter, all sight seems to have been lost of Cibber; nor does there appear to be any evidence that Cibber was taken into custody or punished in any way. Nevertheless, one can find evidence which suggests that Cibber might actually have written the letter. In the first place, nearly all the statements in it are factually true, so far as we know, about Cibber. The letter implies, in the first paragraph, that its author favored the Licensing Act, and Cibber had done so.⁴ But more specific evidence lies in the fourth paragraph. There the author speaks of his having "alter'd from *Shakespeare*" the *Life and Death of King John*, which Cibber only that spring had been engaged in doing. His next statement, that the "Town was so unreasonably prejudiced against its Representation" that he withdrew it, is also true; he withdrew the play because he feared it was going to be damned.⁵

In the following paragraphs the author discusses what portions need to be eliminated from *King John* to make it suitable for production on the stage. There he quotes four passages from Shakespeare's play which might prove political dynamite; of the first two the author of the letter says that he omitted them in his adaptation of *King John*, and it is notable that in Cibber's adaptation of that play—which was not published until 1745 as *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John* and which it seems unlikely would have been seen in manuscript by anyone wishing to write a letter of this sort—those two passages are entirely missing. Of the other two passages the author merely says that the editor and reader may consider how they might be interpreted; here it is interesting to note that, in Cibber's adaptation, the third was restated, the last omitted. The rephrasing of the third, which does not affect the meaning, is as follows:

⁴ See Cibber's *Apology*, Chapter VIII.

⁵ This incident would certainly have been in the minds of most Londoners who followed literary or even political affairs, for there was a good deal of writing, explanatory and satiric, concerning the episode. See C. W. Nichols, "Fielding and the Cibbers," *PQ*, I, 284-85, and my articles, "Cibber, *King John*, and the Students of the Law," *MLN*, LIII (1938), 272-75 and "Fielding's Last Season with the Haymarket Theatre," *MP*, XXXVI (1939), 286-87.

O! 'tis the Curse of Princes to be serv'd
 By Slaves, that take their Wishes for a Warrant;
 That, on the bare Inquietude of Looks,
 Presume t'expound our Passions into Law,
 And on the Sanction of a Frown commit
 Such Deeds as damns the Conscience that conceives them.

It is possible, in view of Cibber's extensive alterations of Shakespeare's play in his adaptation of it, that three passages out of the four cited could have been omitted by chance, but the coincidence seems rather strong.¹

On the other hand, there is a great deal of evidence that tends to suggest that the whole letter was a hoax so far as Cibber's authorship was concerned. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, in discussing the fact that the issue of the *Craftsman* containing the letter resulted in the printer's being taken into custody, refers to its authorship in phraseology which suggests that there was doubt then whether Cibber was actually the author:

It may suffice therefore at present to observe that it is wrote in the Person of C. C--bb-r, Esq. P. L. for the use (as pretended) of the noble Licenser of Plays'

The phrase "in the Person of C C--bb-r" may be only the result of caution on the part of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, but the phrase "as pretended" expresses an even greater doubt of its authenticity. Too, it will be noticed that the *Gazetteer* of July 7 is so phrased as to suggest that the writers of that journal thought the letter was probably written by the *Craftsman* itself. The *Gazetteer* mentions that the *Craftsman* has often been carried by his "furious Zeal" into "very Extraordinary Lengths before" and, without mentioning Cibber, continues to say that "in that Paper he [presumably D'Anvers] has . . . exceeded every thing that could be imagined, even from him" Similarly, the defense which the *Craftsman* made in its issue of August 6 does not refer to Cibber by name; instead of saying, as an editor often does, that he took the letter at its face value, the *Craftsman* launched into a defense of the purpose of the letter and appears to betray a greater knowledge of the origin and purpose of it than he would have needed to plead if he were not the author.

¹ Another possibility is that when, years later, Cibber finally published his alteration as *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John* (1745), the recollection of these citations in the *Craftsman* might have suggested to him that he omit them from his revision.

² *Gentleman's Magazine*, VII (July, 1737), 430

A great deal of the other evidence against Cibber's authorship is less tangible. In the first place, Cibber had earlier that spring, on February 4, published a letter in the *Daily Advertiser* to which he had signed his full name. In the second place, there appears to have been no public ridicule of Cibber for this letter, and, as every one knows, nearly every act of Cibber's brought ridicule upon him from one source or another. To be sure, many of the journals or people who might have turned the letter against Cibber were not active anymore—Fielding, if still producing plays, undoubtedly would have made interesting dramatic capital if he had thought the letter truly by Cibber. Nevertheless, the *Grub Street Journal*, still active, seems to have passed the letter by without giving it particular attention, an action contrary to its usual practice. The *Daily Advertiser*, one of the less politically biased dailies of which a file for July, 1737, is extant, appears not to have mentioned during that month the letter or the taking into custody of the printer of the *Craftsman*. Significant, too, is the fact that there seems to be no allusion to the episode in *An Apology for the Life of Mr T. C., Comedian* (London 1740), sometimes attributed to Henry Fielding, who might have been expected to refer to the incident.

Some of the internal evidence within the letter also seems not Cibberian in tone or material. This is especially true of the last paragraph. Though the statements in the opening paragraph of the letter—that the author has "several Plays by Heart" and "is the best Judge in England of all *dramatical Performances*"—are not unlike Cibber's frequent boastful frankness about himself, the last paragraph contains some statements which seem less likely to have come from him willingly. Especially is this true of the remark that he had "already distinguish'd [himself] in so remarkable a Manner, by gutting *other People's Works*." That is what Cibber's enemies had been saying about him every time he adapted another author's plays—Vanbrugh's or Shakespeare's—for the stage, and it seems very unlikely that Cibber himself would have referred to his own efforts in such baldly uncomplimentary and satiric tones.

Thus, it may be said, that, although there is a great deal of material which points toward an accurate knowledge of Cibber's activities, there is only one portion of the evidence—the four passages extracted from Shakespeare's *King John* for examination, with three of them omitted from Cibber's adaptation—which was not public knowledge at the time. Even so, the omission of three of the cited passages from *King John*

may possibly be due to chance or to his deciding, in the years intervening between the appearance of this letter in 1737 and the adaptation in 1745, that it would be a matter of wisdom to omit such material from stage production. The other evidence—the phrasing of some portions of the letter, the absence of ridicule or discussion of Cibber's supposed part in it, and, finally, the seemingly unwise act of Cibber's choosing an Opposition paper in which to set forth a request for a Government position—suggests that Cibber's name was used by the *Craftsman* as a protection for itself and that no one was for very long of the opinion that Cibber actually wrote the letter. At any rate, it seems more likely that Cibber did not write it than that he did.

ARMOR AND WEAPONS IN THE MIDDLE ENGLISH ROMANCES

ROBERT W. ACKERMAN

Instructor in English

I

Virtually every writer who has dealt with the Middle English romances has committed himself in regard to the accuracy with which these poems reflect the life of their day. Opinions on this issue differ sharply: some scholars hold that there is, in general, little correspondence between the romances and their times,¹ and others assert that a considerable amount of realism is to be found in the romance portrayals of mediaeval life.² An investigation of one important phase of this large problem—namely, the reflection in the romances of mediaeval military equipment—will, it is hoped, help to clarify the existing confusion.

In the typical romance story, the chief personages belong to the aristocratic or knightly class,³ and, consequently, one finds that armor, arms, and military adventure figure prominently in all but a very few of the hundred-odd Middle English chivalric poems that survive. It must be admitted, however, that clear descriptions of the war equipment and warlike exploits of the heroes of romance are disappointingly rare by reason of a common failing of romance poets. This failing is a

¹Typically, literary historians assume that the romances are 'fanciful'—that the usual romance is, as Dr. Johnson once stated, "a military fable of the Middle Ages, a tale of wild adventure in love and chivalry." Bishop Hurd observed that the old romances "outraged the truth in their extravagant pictures of chivalry" (*Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, 1762 [ed. Edith J. Morley, London, 1911], p. 146). In Bishop Hurd's opinion, many contemporary scholars concur. Ernest Albert Baker in *The History of the English Novel: The Age of Romance* . . . (London, 1924), pp. 11-49; Rowland Edmund Prothero, Lord Ernle in *The Light Reading of Our Ancestors* (London, 1927), pp. 72-85; George Wyndham in *Essays in Romantic Literature* by George Wyndham, ed. Charles Whibley (London, 1919), pp. 5-41; and Reinald Hoops in *Der Begriff 'Romance' in der mittelenglischen und frühneuenglischen Literatur*, "Anglistische Forschungen," Heft 68 (Heidelberg, 1929), p. 54.

²See Henry Osborn Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind* (New York, 1919), I, 574-603, and Charles Victor Langlois, *La Société française au XIII^e siècle d'après des romans d'aventure* (2nd ed., Paris, 1904), especially p. iii.

³The heroes of romance are always feudal nobles and generally men of great estate and importance. It is true that the hero in the Scottish poem, *Rauf Coilspear*, and the Carl in *The Carle of Carelyle* are basely born men, but in both cases it is evident that the poets were relating amusing tales. The incongruity of conferring knighthood on such ignoble louts as Rauf and the Carl was doubtless meant to be the chief point of humor.

seemingly irresistible preference for common-places, or trite, colorless expressions in place of fresh, original description, and nowhere is it better illustrated than when armor and weapons are mentioned. No doubt, contemporaneous listeners could read missing detail into these worn-out formulas so treasured by romance composers and singers, but it must have wearied even the mediaeval audience to hear repeated again and again, in the course of a single poem, such tags as "bryght swerdus," "ryche hawberkes," "geldene scheldus," "wiþ helme on heuede and brini brigt," "wiþ scheld & wiþ spere," "with helme, schelde, and hauberke browne," or "helme, hauberke and all of stele." Of course, the poets occasionally broke through such traditional phrasing and wrote clear-enough descriptions of the arms and armor with which their heroes were provided, and it is with these passages that the present study is concerned.

The degree of realism represented by the more satisfactory passages of description may be determined, of course, only by comparisons with actual mediaeval armor and weapons. It is necessary, then, to enter upon brief discussions of the various types of military equipment which the knights of England (only the English romances being studied here) are known to have used.⁴

II

The most important part of the knight's accoutrements was his body armor. It is possible to distinguish several stages in the development of the body armor worn by English knights during the feudal age, which for present purposes may be dated from 1066 to 1485:

i. The primitive ringed byrnie, or leathern coat on which iron rings were sewed, was worn by Norman invaders and by Anglo-Norman knights till about 1180.⁵ The equally primitive padded or quilted body protector seems also to have been worn during this period.⁶

⁴ For full accounts of mediaeval military equipment, see Guy Francis Lalang, *A Record of European Arms and Armour*, London, 1920-25; Alwin Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1889; and Hans Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst in Rahmen der politischen Geschichte*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1900-07. It is not possible to include in this paper a consideration of the brasses and the other non-literary evidence from which our knowledge of the arms and armor used by actual English knights is derived.

⁵ Charles H. Ashdown, *Armour and Weapons in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1925), pp. 23-27.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

On the Bayeux Tapestry the differences in cross-hatching by which the warriors' hauberks are represented suggest that some may have been quilted but that most of them were covered with iron rings. *The Bayeux Tapestry Reproduced in Autotype Plates*, ed. Frank Rede Fowkes (London, 1875), plates XXIII, XXIV, and LIV through LXXIX.

ii. The coat hauberk fashioned entirely of meshed iron rings or chain-mail, instead of iron rings sewed on a fabric or leathern tunic, was the chief form of armor from approximately 1180 till 1325. During the later years of this period, the hauberk was often supplemented by an iron breast-plate and by elbow guards of *cuir bouilli* or of metal. The knights also wore hose of chain-mail the knees of which were reinforced by leathern or metal guards.⁷

iii. For a short time in the early fourteenth century (about 1325-35), a kind of composite armor was worn which consisted of a thickly padded shirt known as the haqueton, the chain-mail hauberk, a padded or quilted coat called the gambeson, and sometimes a loose, outer robe (*cyclas*) as well. Apparently the three layers of quilted, loosely fitting fabric protectors had the effect of deadening a sword blow or a lance thrust, and, when backed up by the chain-mail hauberk, must have constituted an efficient, though scarcely impenetrable, defense. Armor of this type, however, occasioned the wearers considerable discomfort, especially in warm weather.⁸

iv. This stifling composite armor was supplanted before the middle of the fourteenth century by a new form of reinforced chain-mail hauberk. Instead of being strengthened merely by leathern or metal elbow guards and breast-plate, the hauberk of this period was ribbed with narrow plates or splints of steel affixed to the arms, breast, and back. Studded or splinted armor, as it was called, was used particularly during the period 1335-60.⁹

v. In the late fourteenth century, English knights wore plate-mail, or body armor formed of steel plates bent to conform to the body and fixed together with flexible joints to allow tolerably free motion. So-called Gothic armor, or complete suits of plate, grooved to cause a sword or lance point to slide off the surface, came to be used in England after about 1430.¹⁰ The Gothic style of armor, of which many examples survive, was the most beautiful and effective devised by mediaeval craftsmen.¹¹

It is seen, then, that body armor developed from the crudely reinforced leathern jerkin or ringed byrnie of William the Conqueror's day into the carefully fitted and beautifully decorated cap-a-pie suits

⁷ Ashdown, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-42, and 53-57

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-74, and p. 80

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-82

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 113-18, and 137-40

¹¹ See illustrations in Laking, *op. cit.*

of complete steel belonging to the fifteenth century. Not every stage in this five-hundred-year evolution is represented in the Middle English romances, but several of the numerous types of body armor are unmistakably and rather often depicted:

i. In the first place, there seem to be no recognizable descriptions of the ancient ringed byrnie of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

ii. The next stage in the development of armor—chain-mail—is represented in a large number of romances. At least, such common phrases as “bryghte mayles” or “clere maylis”¹² suggest armor composed entirely of iron links (“mayles”) rather than any other sort. The poets often draw a distinction between chain-mail hauberks which were bright and clean (“brini brygt”) and those which were rusty (“hauberke browne”). Evidently, clean and shining armor was preferable, and one of the special virtues of the armor, on one occasion donned by the celebrated Guy of Warwick, was that it had not rusted during thirty years of disuse:

Thritty wynters and well more
Was hit not on-folden ore.
Hit was so clere and so bryght,
All the hall shone of the lyght¹³

Many romance knights appear to have been attired not simply in the chain-mail hauberk, but in chain-mail reinforced with iron breast-plate and guard-plates of metal for knee or elbow. Plates, in fact, are very often mentioned in such phrases as “Wip helme, & plate, & brini brygt,”¹⁴ but much clearer descriptions of reinforced chain-mail are to be found. For example, Libeaus Desconus is said to have cut through his opponent’s hauberk, breast-plate, and gipel or padded vest:

Libeaus was a werrior wist
And smitte a stroke of mist
porug gipell, plate and maile¹⁵

King Richard is for one of his encounters provided “wip plates off good steel”¹⁶ under his hauberk, and in *Eger and Grime*, the hero is

¹² *Morte Arthure*, ed. George G. Perry, *EETS*, VII (1865), v. 2250 and 3646.

¹³ *Guy of Warwick*, ed. Julius Zupitza, *EETSES*, XLII, XLIX, LIX (1883, 1887, 1891), Caius MS, vv. 8105-08.

¹⁴ *Guy of Warwick*, ed. cit., Auchinleck MS, stanza 91, v. 2.

¹⁵ *Libeaus Desconus*, ed. Max Kaluza, *Allenglische Bibliothek*, V (Leipzig, 1890), vv. 1471-73.

¹⁶ *Richard Coeur de Lyon*, ed. Karl Brunner, *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, XLII (Wien und Leipzig, 1913), v. 5706.

shown tearing the breast-plate from his fallen enemy that he might give him the *coup de grace*:

he let him neuer recouer more,
his brest plate from him he cast,
& thrise to the hart he him thrust "

iii. Heavily padded body protectors—the "linges armeüres" mentioned in *Guillaume le Maréchal*¹⁸—were no doubt used throughout the feudal age, but, as has been stated, the cyclas and the quilted gambeson and haqueton, in conjunction with the chain-mail hauberk, were especially favored by English knights during the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Armor of this sort was worn by a large number of romance heroes. In *Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne*, eleven of the Twelve Peers are shown assisting Roland to don haqueton and hauberk:

Eleven duspers stode hym by
To arme sir Rowlande full hastyly,
bat prouede was in Batayle
An actone thay threwe appon hym hye
And ane hawberke sekerly,
bat tekire was of Mayle "

King Clariel, Roland's opponent in the duel he was about to fight, was likewise equipped with haqueton and hauberk.²⁰ Gray Steele and the Red Knight in the romance *Sir Perceval of Gales* are other heroes who wore a haqueton under the hauberk.²¹ The gambeson worn by Guy of Warwick is mentioned more than once,²² and, in the romance *Richard Coer de Lyon*, Richard is said to have worn haqueton, hauberk, plate, and gambeson in a tournament:

Such a stroke he hym lente
That Rycharde feet out of his steropes wente,
For plate, ne for acketton,
For hawberke, ne for campeson,

¹⁸ Ed James Ralston Caldwell, *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, IX (Cambridge [Mass.], 1933), Percy MS., vv 1086-88

¹⁹ *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed Paul Meyer, *Société de l'Histoire de France* (Paris, 1891-1901), v 311

²⁰ In *The English Charlemagne Romances*, Part II, ed Sidney J Herrtage, *BETSES*, XXXV (1880), vv 349-54

²¹ *Ibid*, vv 1189-1200

²² *Eger and Grime*, ed *cit.*, Huntington MS., v 1517; *Sir Perceval of Gales*, ed J Campion and F Holthausen, *All- und mittenglische Texte*, V (Heidelberg, 1913), v. 1102

²³ *Guy of Warwick*, ed *cit.*, Auchinleck MS., st 93, v 7, and st 118, v 4

Suche a stroke he neuer had none ore
That dyde hym halfe so moche sore²⁵

Instead of the haqueton, one occasionally finds the romance knight wearing the somewhat later jupon over his hauberk. The jupon appears to have been a sleeveless, padded tunic, made of silk, velvet, or leather, decorated in various ways, and laced tightly over the hauberk.²⁶ In the terrible duel between Arthur and Modred described in the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, it is stated that King Arthur wore the jupon:

The ffelonne with þe ffyne swerde freschely he strykes,
The ffelettes of þe ferrere syde he flasschet in sondyre
Thorowe jopowne and jesserawnte of gentile mailes!²⁷

The word "jesserawnte" refers to the composition of the king's hauberk. Jazerant-work was made of two layers of leather or fabric between which steel links were sewed.²⁸ In reality, jazerant-work was a form of chain-mail, and it was used both for hauberks and leg protectors ("Hose of Hawberke Gesseraunte"²⁹) indefinitely early. The knights in *Sir Degrevant*, it might be noted, also wore jupons over jazerant hauberks:

doghety sir degrevant
lays þe Erle on þe launde
Thorow Japone and Jesserant
he lamed þaire knyghttes³⁰

iv The cumbersome composite armor worn by Richard, Roland, and other heroes was superseded by splinted armor which has been described. A very few instances of this mid-fourteenth century style of body armor may be found in the romances. In *Guy of Warwick*, the Danish giant, Colbrond, seems to have been equipped with splinted armor:

Of mailes was nougt his hauberk.
It was al of anoper werk,
þat meruail is to here
Alle it were picke splentes of stiel,
picke y-joined strong & wel,
To kepe þat fendes fere
Hossen he hadde also wele y wrouzt,

²⁵ *Ed cit*, vv 373-78.

²⁶ Ashdown, *op cit*, p 100-01

²⁷ *Ed cit*, vv 4237-39

²⁸ Ashdown, *op cit*, p 26.

²⁹ *Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne*, *ed cit*, v 355

³⁰ Ed Karl Luick, *Wiener Beitrage zur englischen Philologie*, XI.VIII (Wien und Leipzig, 1917), Thornton MS, vv 305-08

Oþer þan splentes was it nouȝt
Fram his fot to his swere²⁰

The word "splents" also occurs in *Eger and Grime*, but its meaning there is uncertain.²⁰

v. The latter part of the fourteenth century saw the beginnings of a new type of armor. Instead of encasing their bodies either in chain-mail reinforced in various ways, or in the stifling gambeson and haqueton, the knights wore steel plates that were curved to conform to the body. With time, the skill of armorers with respect to jointing and shaping the plates increased, until even the gauntlets and foot protectors (sollerets) of the knight were fashioned of steel. Plate-armor came to be used almost exclusively in the fifteenth century, but in the romances there seem to be no descriptions of the beautiful suits of cunningly jointed plate one usually thinks of when mediaeval armor is mentioned. Nevertheless, one occasionally finds allusions to certain pieces of plate-armor. Gray Steele, for example, wore steel gauntlets:

And then he came right soon again,
Where that the knight was lying slain:
And then his right hand off he took,
Syne in a glove of plate it shook²¹

The sleeve of a plate hauberk seems to be described in the following passage from *Morte Arthure*.

An alet enamelde he oches in sondire,
Bristed þe rerebrace with the bronde ryche,
Kerves of at þe couter with þe clene egge
Anetes þe avawmbrace, vrayllede with silver!
Thorowe a dowble vesture of velvett ryche,
With þe venymous swerde a vayne has he towchede!²²

In his duel with Gawain, Priamus knocked off one of his opponent's aillettes and one of his elbow protectors, and split open both his rerebrace and vambrace, penetrating the velvet sleeve and inflicting a

²⁰ *Ed cit*, Auchinleck MS, st. 256, vv 1-9

²¹ *Ed cit*, Percy MS, v 959

²² *Eger and Grime, ed. cit*, Huntington MS, vv 1639-42

²³ *Ed cit*, vv 2565-70 The "alet" or ailette was an auxiliary guard-plate that was affixed to the shoulder of the hauberk to protect the neck; Gawain's aillettes were evidently made of enameled steel. The "rerebrace," from French *arrière-bras*, was that part of the plate sleeve that covered the upper arm. The "couter," from French *coudière*, was the part of the plate sleeve that protected the elbow, covering the gap between the rerebrace and the vambrace. The "avawmbrace" or vambrace, from French *avant-bras*, was the lower part of the plate sleeve

wound, probably on the forearm. This passage, it would seem, could refer only to the various parts of the sleeve of a plate hauberk. None of the other warriors in *Morte Arthure*, however, were clad in plate armor.

Of the several types of body armor discussed here, it appears that the heroes of romance were most frequently attired either in rather vaguely described chain-mail, sometimes of the reinforced variety, or in the composite armor of the first half of the fourteenth century. A few hints of the later plate-armor may be found, but they are definitely exceptional.

The second most important part of the knight's protective equipment—the helm—underwent few changes. The conical steel cap of the Normans with its metal nasal guard, as pictured in the Bayeux Tapestry,³³ was used in England till about 1200, when it was superseded by the pot-*heaume* or cylindrical helm that, resting on the shoulders, covered the head, face, and neck completely. The pot-*heaume* was refined in later years by the addition of a movable ventail or visor, and was sometimes surmounted by a crest. In the reign of Edward III, a lighter form of head-gear—the basinet—was often used, but the great helm continued to be worn in battle and tournament. Under the helm, the knight usually wore a steel cap probably lined with wool; and sometimes a chain-mail coif covered the head as well. Occasionally the steel cap worn under the helm was called a basinet.³⁴

The knight's headgear is rarely described in the Middle English romances, although both of the most common forms, helms and basinets, are mentioned frequently.³⁵ Sometimes, as in *Beues of Hamtoun*,³⁶ the terms, helm and basinet, are used to denote the outer head protector, but in another passage in the same romance "bacinet" designates the steel cap worn under the helm:

þe dragoun harde him gan asaail
& smot on þe helm with his taile,
þat his helm cleuede ato,
And his bacinet dede also.³⁷

³³ *Ed. cit.*, plates XIX, XXI, XXIII, XXIV, etc.

³⁴ Ashdown, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29, 42-45, 60-66, 74-75, 82-84, 97-100, 109. For illustrations see Laking, *op. cit.*

³⁵ *Sir Degrevant*, *ed. cit.*, Cambridge MS., vv. 341-44, and v. 1635.

³⁶ *Ed. Eugen Kölbing, FETSES, XLVI, XLVIII, LXV (1885, 1886, 1894), v. 1464.*

³⁷ *Ed. cit.*, vv. 2845-48.

The visor of the helm is often alluded to as is the lacing of the ventail before battle. For example, the eleven peers who armed Roland for his duel

Broghte hym ane helme of bettant,
& lacede his auentale³⁹

Passages according to the helm a more detailed treatment are not to be found in the English poems. One is particularly surprised to note that the Middle English poets missed the opportunity of describing the gaudy heraldic crests which often surmounted the helms worn in the fifteenth century.

The third article of defensive equipment—the shield—was, in its early form, a large kite-shaped wooden protector curved slightly and running to a length of perhaps four and a half feet. Straps on the reverse side permitted the knight to bear the shield on his left arm. The large Norman shield gave way to a smaller heater-shaped type during the latter part of the fourteenth century, when improved body armor made this form of protection less vital. After the introduction of plate-armor, the shield does not seem to have been needed; nevertheless, small shields were affixed to the left shoulder of tournament armor, because it was at the knight's left side that the tilting opponent aimed his lance. It should be noted that the earliest heraldic bearings appeared on the shields of thirteenth-century knights⁴⁰.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of the shield as it is represented in the romances. Except when the poets were interested in depicting the heraldic cognizances painted thereon,⁴¹ they did little more than mention this piece of defensive equipment.

Because it was of prime importance for the knight to keep his horse under him in battle or tournament, defensive armor for the charger, or *destrier*, was used rather early. In the time of Edward I chain-mail and quilted pads protected the horse from lance thrusts and sword

³⁹ *Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne*, ed. cit., vv. 356-57. The meaning of "bettant" is obscure.

⁴⁰ Ashdown, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30, 48-49, 75-76, 106-07. Even on the shields depicted on the Bayeux Tapestry there are designs which might later have developed into heraldic bearings. *Ed. cit.*, especially plate LXXIV. A discussion of armorial bearings on shields may be found in Francis A. Barnard, "Heraldry," in *Medieval England*, ed. H. W. C. Davis (Oxford, 1924), pp. 201-02.

⁴¹ King Arthur, for example, hung a shield decorated with armorial bearings around the neck of Libeaus Desconus on the occasion of the knighting of the young hero. *Libeaus Desconus*, ed. cit., vv. 85-93.

blows, and during the fifteenth century plate-armor shaped to cover head, face, breast, and rump appeared.⁴¹ As is well known, the chargers used by knights in warfare and in the tournament lists were of a large breed especially developed to carry tremendous weight.⁴²

Despite the military importance of the horse, equine armor is not noticed in the romances. On the other hand, the war horse, like Rocinante, sometimes plays a definite rôle in the plot of the romance and is given a full set of character traits and a name

Among the knight's weapons, the sword was undoubtedly the most effective, and it underwent slight change throughout the feudal age. In general, the sword was pointed, two-edged, and cross-hilted, and its blade was about thirty inches in length. It could be used for thrusting, cutting, or simply for striking.⁴³ Battering at the helm or neck armor of one's opponent with the sword must have been a favored technique of warriors in close combat. During the fourteenth century, two-handed swords made their appearance. These weapons had a blade sometimes as long as fifty inches, and the grip was long enough to permit the use of both hands so that great sweeping blows could be delivered. The hand-and-half or bastard sword, likewise coming into use during the fourteenth century, had a forty-inch blade and could be wielded with one or with both hands. These great swords were not much used in England, it seems, but they acquired some popularity in Scotland, where they were called claymores.⁴⁴

In the romances, the sword is never pictured, but the ancient custom of ascribing great virtues to old weapons is sometimes observed. Both Roland and Guy of Warwick fight with antique swords, that of the latter, in fact, was once the property of none other than Hector of Troy.⁴⁵ The rather unusual two-handed sword, it should be noted, appears in *Sir Degrevant*. The hero is waylaid when on his way to his lady's

⁴¹ Ashdown, *op cit.*, pp. 197-99. In later feudal times, the devising of armor for the *destrier* was an advanced art, and each piece of equine armor had its particular name. For example, the steel cap protecting the horse's head was called the *tester*. See the author's article "Testiere Knight's Tale, 2499," *Modern Language Notes*, XLIX (1934), 397-400.

⁴² There is a discussion of the use of the horse in mediaeval warfare in George T. Denison's *A History of Cavalry from the Earliest Times With Lessons for the Future*, 2nd ed., London, 1913.

⁴³ Ashdown, *op cit.*, pp. 32, 107-08.

⁴⁴ C. H. Ashdown, *British and Foreign Arms and Armour* (London and Edinburgh, 1909), pp. 336-37. See also Walter Meller, *A Knight's Life in the Days of Chivalry* (London, 1924), p. 74.

⁴⁵ *Guy of Warwick*, ed. *cit.*, Auchinleck MS., st. 93, v. 2.

bower, and he hews a way through his enemies with this weapon:

With his twohand-swerde
he made swylk pay,
þat flourty lay in þe felde
bothe with spere and with schelde *

Again, in the *Squyr of Lowe Degre*, the hero is said to have wielded "a baalarde large and longe."⁴¹ A "baalarde" is a short sword or dagger, a meaning which is in ill accord with the adjectives "large and longe." An alternate reading of "baalarde," however, is "bastarde," and one is perhaps justified in supposing that the hand-and-half or bastard sword is here referred to by the poet.

The lance, second in importance among the knight's weapons, consisted of a heavy wooden staff ranging in length from five to ten or twelve feet. Its use was generally restricted to fighting on horseback.⁴² With his lance held firmly under his right arm and aimed across his horse's neck, the knight would spur his mount toward an opponent, striving to unseat him by a blow on the breast, helm, or right shoulder, and simultaneously he would attempt to avoid or parry a direct thrust from the other's lance. The lance used in serious warfare was usually rather short and heavy and provided with a sharp iron point. The longer lance used in tournaments, however, was often tipped with a coronal rather than a point, and the shaft was sometimes of hollow construction so that it might be readily shattered. In tilting, the knight took great pride in retaining his saddle even when his adversary's lance splintered against his shield or his breast.⁴³

Romance writers speak often enough of the lance or "spere," but seldom is the reader told more about this weapon than that it was

A schafft wrought off trusty werk.⁴⁴

In a passage in *Richard Coer de Lyon*, however, the measurements of an immense lance wielded by the king was given:

He bare a shafte that was grete and stronge,
It was fourtene fote long;

* *Ed cit.*, Thornton MS, vv 1659-62

* *Ed* William E. Mead (Boston and New York, 1904), v 1013.

* The uses to which the lance could be put are well illustrated in the Bayeux Tapestry. *Ed cit.*, plates LVI, LVIII, LXI, LXII, etc.

* Ashdown, *Armour and Weapons in the Middle Ages*, pp. 31, 108, 126-27.

* *Richard Coer de Lyon*, *ed cit.*, v 5708. Sometimes the lance is called a "spere," as in *Torrent of Portyngale*, EETS, LI (1887), v. 2470.

And it was both grete and stoute,
One and twenty inches aboute.⁸²

Even though this incredibly great lance was tipped with a coronal (v. 297) rather than a sharp point, Richard did a vast amount of damage to his adversaries. A coronaled lance also appears in *Libeaus Desconus*.⁸³ The mention of the coronal, and the frequency with which lances are splintered in the romances suggest that the writers usually had in mind the hollow, lightly constructed tournament lance rather than a formidable, iron-pointed weapon of war

Other weapons were used by historical knights, particularly the short-hafted axe, the mace in different forms, and the misericorde, a dagger usually worn on the right hip.⁸⁴ Dismounted knights seem occasionally to have fought with pole-axe, guisarme, or pike, but such rude pole-weapons were commonly reserved for the infantry.⁸⁵

Sometimes the romance knight is also represented as being equipped with axe or mace. In *Guy of Warwick*, Herhaud "so sore" swings with a "damsax" that he slays more than sixty Saracens,⁸⁶ and it is with an axe that Sir Guy dispatches the terrible giant Colbrond.⁸⁷ In *Richard Coer de Lyon*, King Richard is pictured reeling under a vicious blow from a brass mace.⁸⁸ In *Eger and Grime*, the accoutrements of Gray Steele are given considerable attention, and the knight's mace is described thus:

A mase of gold full royallie,
on the top stooode a Carbunkle bright,
it shoone as Moone dothe in the night.⁸⁹

The poet wishes his readers to believe that this golden-shafted mace had a luminous carbuncle, a fabulous mediaeval gem,⁹⁰ for a head. The

⁸² *Ed cit.*, vv. 285-88.

⁸³ *Ed cit.*, v. 987.

⁸⁴ Illustrations of axes, maces, and other weapons are to be found in Ashdown, *Armor and Weapons in the Middle Ages*, pp. 192-3.

⁸⁵ See illustrations in Ashdown, *Armor and Weapons in the Middle Ages*, pp. 129-34.

⁸⁶ *Ed cit.*, Auchinleck MS., vv. 3585-89.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, Auchinleck MS., st. 267-69.

⁸⁸ *Ed cit.*, vv. 371-72.

⁸⁹ *Ed cit.*, Percy MS., vv. 968-70.

⁹⁰ Luminosity is a mythological property of the carbuncle which mediaeval writers seldom fail to mention. The stone is described in the lapidaries, of course, and also appears in many literary pieces. The luminous "carbuncle" is mentioned in Chaucer's *The House of Fame*, v. 1363, and in the Middle English translation of *The Romance of the Rose* (often attributed to Chaucer), vv. 1119-24.

pole-axe also appears several times in the hands of romance knights. A threat twice muttered by King Richard is

And yf the dogge wyll come to me,
My pollaxe shall his bane be.⁶⁰

In *Sir Degrevant*, a wicked pole-weapon called the glaive is used in tournament fighting:

Glaives gleterand þay glent
On gleterand scheldys⁶¹

The bow, another weapon traditionally used only by footmen, is nevertheless of great importance in the history of mediaeval warfare. Three forms of the bow were used during the feudal age. The short-bow, the earliest of these, was perhaps three feet long and was drawn to the chest. Its use is amply illustrated in the Bayeux Tapestry.⁶² The cross-bow, or arbalest, was much stiffer than the short-bow, but it was mounted on a barrel or stock, so that it might be cocked by a lever, small windlass, or other mechanical device. The cross-bow shot bolts or quarrels with considerable force and accuracy, and in the thirteenth century was held to be a terrible weapon.⁶³ The Welsh long-bow⁶⁴ was five or six feet in length and was drawn to the ear. This weapon was introduced into England during the reign of Edward I and came to supplant not only the short-bow, but, to a large extent, the cross-bow as well, when it was learned that English archers could find weak joints even in a suit of mail with their cloth-yard shafts. The advantages of the long-bow over the arbalest lay in the fact that it could be discharged much more rapidly, and in its equal if not greater range and accuracy. It was by a judicious combination of archers and dismounted men-at-arms that the English won the battles of Dupplin (1332) and Halidon Hill (1333) against the Scots, and the same tactics were responsible

⁶⁰ *Richard Coeur de Lyon*, ed. cit., vv 6941-42. See also v 6814.

⁶¹ *Ed. cit.*, vv 295-96.

⁶² *Ed. cit.*, plates XLI, XLIII, etc.

⁶³ For illustrations and a discussion of the arbalest, see Laking, *op. cit.*, I, 126.

⁶⁴ One of the earliest notices of the long-bow is to be found in a highly interesting passage in the *Itinerarium Cambriae* of Giraldus Cambrensis (Lib I, cap 4). Ed. J. F. Dimock, "Rolls Series" (London, 1861-91), VI, 54.

Sir Charles Oman, in his *History of the Art of War* (New York and London, 1898), p. 559, note 1, refers to another passage in the *Itinerarium* (Lib II, cap. 5) for a description of the Welsh long-bow. Here, however, Professor Oman seems to be in error, for the phrase "in modum arcis acutissimos," the sole reference to a bow in this chapter, is quite clearly meant to be descriptive of the contour of the Welsh mountains.

for the victories of Crécy and Poitiers.⁶³ In fact, the long-bow, like gunpowder,⁶⁴ played no inconsiderable part in lessening the age-long military supremacy of the knight, and thus, in contributing to the downfall of the feudal régime.

The fact that the bow was *par excellence* the mark of the humble foot soldier is well respected in the romances, but a conspicuous exception is found in the royal knight, King Richard:

Richard bente an arweblast off vvs,
And schotte it to a tour fful euene
And it smot þorwȝ Sarezynes seuene"

Although archers and cross-bowmen or arbalesters are mentioned time and again in the English poems, Richard seems to be the only romance knight who used the bow in battle

III

To summarize the foregoing observations With respect to body armor, it has been shown that certain heroes of romance are attired in chain-mail or reinforced chain-mail, and in the padded composite armor of the early part of the fourteenth century The splinted style of armor of a somewhat later date is very rarely represented, and, although fifteenth-century plate-armor is suggested from time to time by the mention of steel gauntlets or of a plate sleeve, it is nowhere fully described. It may be said, then, that romance knights are traditionally depicted as wearing the body armor which was popular in England during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries

The other important features of the knight's defensive equipment—the helm and shield—are by no means well portrayed, and armor for the *destrier* does not appear

Swords, even the uncommon two-handed and hand-and-half varieties, are spoken of in accounts of battles, duels, and tournaments; but the romance poets are never at pains to include satisfactory descriptions.

⁶³ Oman, *op cit*, pp 583-634

⁶⁴ The English are said to have used cannon at Crécy, but the bombards of the fourteenth century do not seem to have possessed notable destructive power Gustav Kohler, *Die Entwicklung des Kriegswesens und der Kriegsführung in der Ritterzeit von Mitte des 11 Jahrhunderts bis zu den Hussitenkriegen* (Breslau, 1886-89), III, Teil I, pp 215-62

Froissart refers to cannon several times in his *Chroniques*, even speaking of their use on ships of war. *Chroniques*, ed Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove (Bruxelles, 1867-77), IX, 70-71; X, 22, and XII, 70-72 Illustrations of these early cannon may be found in Kohler, *op cit*, III, Teil 1, Tafeln 2, 3, 4, and 5

"Richard Coer de Lyon, ed *cit*, vv 3998-4000

The lance is likewise mentioned frequently, but the exact character of this weapon is usually left to the reader's imagination, and the same is true of the axe and the mace. One must make allowance, of course, for such monstrosities and curiosities as King Richard's lance and Sir Gray Steele's jewelled mace, which are rather fully depicted. With few exceptions, romance knights are never shown using the weapons commonly reserved for the humble foot-soldiery, such as the bow and the pole-axe.

One concludes, then, that although the Middle English romance poets are obliged, by the kind of tales they relate, to allude constantly to arms and armor, they seldom reveal much knowledge of a technical nature about mediaeval military equipment. In most instances, weapons or particular pieces of armor are referred to only by name, or else they are described in stock phrases that tell one little or nothing about their composition or appearance. On the other hand, isolated passages occur in some romances in which armor and weapons are given a genuine descriptive treatment. One could scarcely turn to these passages as sources of reliable information on such matters as tournament lances or two-handed swords; yet it seems clear that the writers of romance,⁶⁸ on the infrequent occasions when they choose to portray with some degree of clarity the armor and weapons with which their heroes are provided, draw upon their observation of the contemporaneous military scene.⁶⁹ In other words, because the more satisfactory descriptions of the knight's equipment correspond to articles of warfare in actual use at some time during the later Middle Ages, the terms 'imaginative' or 'fanciful' may not be correctly applied to the treatment accorded this phase of mediaeval life in the English romances.

⁶⁸ It must, of course, be realized that the versions in which most of the Middle English romances have come down to us are many times removed from their original composers, most of whom wrote in Old French. Rather than to one poet, the composition of almost every Middle English romance must be ascribed to several literary men working sometimes at widely separated periods. Hence, it is not surprising that in *Eger and Grime*, *Guy of Warwick*, and some other poems, one finds descriptions of armor worn by actual knights during two different periods. This consideration does not impair the conclusions of the present study, since the question here is whether mediaeval armor of whatever decade is clearly described in the romances.

⁶⁹ The romance poets sometimes speak of a mace made of jewels and precious metal or of "geldene scheldus," probably to suggest the wealth and splendor of their heroes. When one considers that ceremonial arms and armor were frequently composed of rich materials, he can see that to describe military equipment in such terms required no very great stretch of the imagination on the part of mediaeval writers. Truly fanciful descriptions are very rare indeed. An example is the absurd outfit—consisting of two hauberks, two helmets, and a 'double shield'—with which Berard provided himself for his duel with the formidable Guy of Warwick. *Guy of Warwick*, ed. cit., Auchinleck MS., st. 187.

RESEARCH STUDIES
of the
State College of Washington

PRICE LIST OF SEPARATE NUMBERS

Vol. I:

See page 103 of Vol. VI

Vol. II:

- No. 1, Cytology of Triticum, Secale and Aegilops Hybrids with Reference to Phylogeny, by *Hannah C. Aase*, 60 pp 27 figs. Price \$.75
- No. 2, The Japanese Exclusion Bill of 1924, by *Earl H. Pritchard*; Genetic Characters in Relation to Chromosome Numbers in a Wheat Specie-Cross, by *F. J. Stevenson*; Morphological Study of Bulb and Flowers of *Camassia quamash* (Pursh) Greene, by *Anne MacLay LaFingwell*, 28 pp., 3 figs. Price \$.40
- No. 3, The Upward Movement of Inorganic Solutes in plants, by *Harry F. Clements*; Studies in Local Immunity, by *L. A. Barnes*; New and Noteworthy Northwestern Plants, by *Harold St. John*, 28 pp., 4 figs. 1 pl., 1 map. Price \$.40
- No. 4, Dryden's Influence on the Versification of *Lamia*, by *Charles A. Langworthy*; New and Noteworthy Plants of the Pacific Northwest, by *George Neville Jones*; Lessing and English Domestic Tragedy, by *Paul P. Kies*, 32 pp., 1 fig. Price \$.50

Vol. III:

- No. 1, Auto-antibody Production for Bone Marrow, by *Victor Burke, Clorcy F. Bradley, and N. P. Sullivan*; Flora of Redwood Peak, Oakland Hills, California, by *Lincoln Constance*; Salt Tolerance of *Ruppia maritima* in Lakes of High Magnesium Sulphate Content, by *Elisabeth M. McKay*; The Fungous Flora of Normal Apples, by *Glenn A. Huber*; The Inheritance of Resistance to Physiologic Forms of *Tilletia levis* and *T. tritici*, and the Effect of Temperature on Pathogenicity, by *William K. Smith*; Nitrogen in Relation to Composition, Growth, and Yield of Wheat, by *L. D. Donsen*; Investigations on the Etiology and Control of the Blue-Mold Decay of Apples Caused by *Penicillium expansum* Link, by *Kenneth F. Baker*, 36 pp., Price \$.50
- No. 2, Petrarch and the Physicians, by *Don Cameron Allen*; Some Notes on Fielding's Plays, by *Emmett L. Avery*; The Authorship of "Die Englische Schaubuehne," by *Paul P. Kies*; On the Dating of *Othello* and *Lear*, by *Paul P. Kies*, 40 pp., Price \$.50

Vol. IV:

- No. 1, The Genus *Arabis* L. in the Pacific Northwest, by *Reed C. Rollins*; The Electrolysis of Aqueous Solutions of Sodium and Zirconyl Sulfates, by *Henry B. Linford*, 56 pp., 15 figs. Price \$.65
- No. 2, The Problem of Parole, Part I, by *Carl I. Erickson*; The Historical Geography of the Eastern Boundary of Rhode Island, by *Edward L. Ullman*; Downy Mildew of Peas Caused by *Peronospora piri* (Deb.) Syd., by *Leo Campbell*, 36 pp., 4 figs. Price \$.50
- Nos. 3-4, The Crucial Years of Early Anglo-Chinese Relations, 1750-1800, by *Earl H. Pritchard*, 352 pp., 7 figs. Price \$1.75

Vol. V:

- No. 1, Studies in Drought Resistance of the Soy Bean, by *Harry F. Clements*; Language of Institutional Delinquents, by *Paul Fendrick*; The Effects of Continued Application of Irrigation Water and Commercial Fertilizers to

Ephrata Fine Sand in the Wenatchee Orchard District, by *Carl A. Larson*; Henry VIII and the Imperial Election of 1519, by *Harold E. Blinn*; Rest Period Responses and Cold Resistance in the Red Raspberry in Relation to the Breeding of Hardy Varieties, by *Chester Druse Schwartz*; The Making of the *Shepherdes Calender*, by *Roland B. Botting*, 64 pp., 5 plates, Price \$.75

No. 2, Vaudeville on the London Stage, 1700-1737, by *Emmett L. Avery*; A Study of Certain Reactions of the Apple to Soil Moisture and Meteorological Conditions, by *Lawrence Leonard Claypool*; Decomposition Potentials of Fused Salts, by *Roy C. Kirk*; Studies in the Drought Resistance of the Sunflower and the Potato, by *Harry F. Clements*; Fungi Which Cause Decay of Apples in Cold Storage, by *Geo. D. Rushe*; Physiological and Genetical Studies on Delayed Germination in *Avena*, by *LeRoy P. V. Johnson*; Biology and Control of the Douglas-Fir Beetle *Dendroctonus Pseudotsugae* Hopkins (Coleoptera - Scolytidae) with Notes on Associated Insects, by *William Delles Bedard*; Supplement—A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed to 1700 in the Library of the State College of Washington, by *Don Cameron Allen*, 64 pp., 8 plates, Price \$.75

No. 3, The Creation and Dissolution of the Danish-Swedish Alliance of 1628, by *Francis J. Bowman*; Byron's Interest in the Americas, by *B. R. McElderry, Jr.*; The Policy of the American State Department toward Missionaries in the Far East, by *Harold J. Bass*, 64 pp., 1 pl. Price \$.75

No. 4, Browning and the Victorian Public in 1868-69, by *B. R. McElderry, Jr.*; The Utilization of Apple Waste and Preparation of New Products from Apples, by *Harold W. Gerrits*; A Text from Nashe on the Latin Literature of the Sixteenth Century, by *Don C. Allen*; The Effect of Certain Potato and Tobacco Viruses on Tomato Plants, by *Grover Burnell*, 32 pp. Price \$.50

Vol. VI (1938):

No. 1, Mechanisms of Freezing Resistance in the Needles of *Pinus ponderosa* and *Pseudotsuga mucronata*, by *Harry F. Clements*; Fielding's *Universal Gallant*, by *Emmett L. Avery*; An Ecological Study of Kamiak Butte, by *Lowell A. Mullen*, 48 pp., 11 plates, Price \$.50

No. 2, The Problem of Parole, Part II, by *Carl I. Erickson*; The Inheritance of Reaction to Physiologic Races of *Tilletia tritici* (Bjerk.) Wint. in a Winter Wheat Cross, by *Alva M. Schlehuber*; Reaction of Winter Wheat to Physiologic Races of *Tilletia levis* Kühn and *T. tritici* (Bjerk.) Wint., by *Alva M. Schlehuber*; Oxidation-Reduction Potentials of Arsenate-Arsenite Systems in Sand and Soil Mediums, by *Clark M. Keaton*; The Interfacial Tensions of Some Mercury-Hydrocarbon Oils, by *Frits A. Hedman*, 56 pp., 3 fig. Price \$.60

No. 3, Delinquency Areas in Spokane, Washington, by *H. Ashley Weeks* and *Margaret G. Smith*; A Comparison of an English Test and a Psychological Examination at the College Level, by *Newton Jesse Aiken*; A Possible Source of Lessing's *Horoskop*, by *Paul P. Kies*, 24 pp., Price \$.35

No. 4, Pioneer Social Adaptation in the Palouse Country of Eastern Washington, 1870-90, by *Fred R. Yoder*; The Number of Unincorporated Places in the United States and Their Estimated Populations, by *Paul H. Landis*, 60 pp., Price \$.70

Vol. VII (1939):

No. 1 Christopher Smart in London, by *Roland B. Botting*; An Addition to the Canon of Stephen Crane, by *Lyndon U. Pratt*; The French Labor Movement 1880-95, by *Harold E. Blinn*, 72 pp. Price \$.75

No. 2 Victorian Evaluation of *The Ring and the Book*, by *B. R. McElderry, Jr.*; *The Craftsman* of July 2, 1737, and Colley Cibber, by *Emmett L. Avery*; Armor and Weapons in the Middle English Romances, by *Robert W. Ackerman*, 48 pp. Price \$.50

September, 1939

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON



SOCIAL ADAPTATION AND LAG OF THE RURAL CHURCH IN WHITMAN COUNTY, WASHINGTON: <i>Fred R Yoder</i>	- - 123
THE PREPARATION OF GALACTURONIC AND MUCIC ACIDS FROM PECTIC SUBSTANCES: <i>Hugh H. Mottern</i>	- - - 153
VIROSES OF THE GARDEN PEA (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) IN WASHINGTON. <i>Folke Johnson</i>	- - - - - 155
STUDIES ON THE CONTROL OF BLUE-MOLD DECAY OF APPLES: <i>Richard Wellman</i>	- - - - - 157
NEW OR OTHERWISE NOTEWORTHY NORTHWESTERN PLANTS—III: <i>Carl W Sharsmith</i>	- - - - - 159

Presbyterian Church in the United States. It was realized by those leaders who were especially interested in the rural church, that it could not be understood apart from its general social, cultural, and economic setting. In the last two decades many books and monographs treating the rural church from the sociological point of view have appeared.⁵ The Committee on Social and Religious Surveys from 1920 to 1925 conducted a number of studies and published a most valuable series of monographs on the rural church.⁶

Work in Redwood County, Minnesota," "A Rural Survey in Maryland," "A Rural Survey in Arkansas," "A Rural Life Survey in Northwestern Ohio," "A Rural Life Survey in Greene and Claremont Counties, Ohio," "A Rural Survey in Southwestern Ohio" (New York: Department of Church and Country Life, Presbyterian Church in the U S A)

⁵ Among the better books that may be cited are J. O. Ashenhurst, *The Day of the Country Church* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1910); G. A. Bricker, *Solving the Country Church Problem* (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1913); K. L. Butterfield, *The Country Church and the Rural Problem* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1911); E. T. Clark, *The Rural Church in the South* (Nashville, Tennessee: Cokesbury Press, 1924); E. L. Earp, *The Rural Church Movement* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1914); C. L. Fry, *Diagnosing the Rural Church* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924); C. D. Gill and G. Pinchot, *Six Thousand Country Churches* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919); C. J. Galpin, *Empty Churches* (New York: The Century Company, 1925); E. R. Groves, *Using the Resources of the Country Church* (New York: The Association Press, 1917); E. V. O'Hara, *The Church and the Country Community* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927); W. H. Wilson, *The Farmer's Church* (New York: The Century Company, 1925); E. R. Hooker, *Hinterlands of the Church* (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1931); J. W. Jent, *Rural Church Development* (Shawnee, Oklahoma: Baptist University Press, 1928); H. W. McLaughlin, Editor, *The Country Church and Public Affairs* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930); A. J. W. Myers and E. E. Sundt, *The Country Church as It Is* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1930); K. L. Butterfield, *The Christian Enterprise Among Rural People* (Nashville, Tennessee: The Cokesbury Press, 1933); E. deS. Brunner, *Churches of Distinction in Town and Country* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923); E. deS. Brunner, *Tested Methods in Town and Country Churches* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923); E. E. Sundt, *The Country Church and Our Generation* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1932); R. A. Felton, *What's Right with the Rural Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1930); E. A. Roadman, *The Country Church and Its Program* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1925); M. A. Dawber, *Rebuilding Rural America* (New York: The Friendship Press, 1937); Malcom Dana, *Christ of the Countryside* (Nashville, Tennessee: The Cokesbury Press, 1937); J. M. Ormond, *The Rural Church in North Carolina* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1931); Edgar Schmiedler, *A Better Rural Life* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1938).

⁶ Marjorie Patten, *The Country Church in Colonial Counties* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1922); Benson Landis, *Rural Church Life in the Middle West* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1922); E. deS. Brunner, *Church Life in the Rural South* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923); H. O. Belknap, *The Church on the Changing Frontier* (George H. Doran Company, 1922); H. N. Morse and E. deS. Brunner, *The Town and Country Church in the United States* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923).

Special recognition of the service of the rural church to country people has been given by a number of land-grant colleges and universities and other educational institutions in their holding of short institutes for rural ministers for the study and discussion of rural church problems.⁷ Also a number of land-grant colleges and universities have made the rural church a subject for investigation in their scientific studies of rural life.⁸ In the "scope and method" series of monographs published by the Social Science Research Council, the greater part of one monograph is an elaborate outline of methods for research on the rural church.⁹ The Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture has recognized the help that can be given by the program of the rural church and has issued a bulletin showing how the Extension Service and the rural churches can work together for a better rural life.¹⁰ In 1924 the American Country Life Association meeting at Columbus, Ohio, devoted its entire program to a discussion of the country church.¹¹

Several of the larger religious denominations in the United States have established special departments for the study of the problems of

⁷Schools listed by the Committee of Town and Country, The Home Missions Council, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America as sponsoring short courses for rural ministers in 1939 were as follows: Garrett Biblical Institute, University of Wisconsin, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, West Virginia University, Duke University, University of Kentucky, South Dakota State College, University of Nebraska, Pennsylvania State College, Rutgers University, Ohio State University, Iowa State Agricultural College, Purdue University, State College of Washington, Cornell University, Vanderbilt University, and for Negro pastors, Bethune-Cookman College, Sam Houston College, Wiley College, Gulfside College, Rust College, Philander-Smith College, and Gamon Theological Seminary, Georgia State College, Claflin College, Bennett College, Morgan College, Morristown College.

⁸See W G Mather, "The Rural Church of Alleghany County," Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No 587, Mark Rich, "The Larger Parish, An Effective Organization for Rural Churches," Cornell University Extension, Bulletin No 408, Grace Fernandes, "Church Activities of Farm Women and Their Families," Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No 169, C R Hoffer, "Activities of Churches in Town and Country Communities," Michigan Agricultural Station, Bulletin No 226, J H Kolb and C J Bornman, "Rural Religious Organization," Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No 60, W F Kumlein, "The Social Problem of the Church in South Dakota," South Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No 294.

⁹J D Black, ed, *Research in Rural Institutions* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1933).

¹⁰H. W. Hockbaum, "The Rural Church and Cooperative Extension Work," United States Department of Agriculture, Circular No 57.

¹¹*Proceedings 7th National Country Life Conference* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925).

their rural churches, for the education of their rural ministers in new methods of church work, and for the formulation of programs adequate for the rural church of the present day. The programs of the country life departments of these churches which have given special attention to the problems of the rural church have been directed largely toward the following objectives: (1) a better understanding of the rural church in relation to its natural, technological, industrial, demographic, social, and cultural background; (2) the establishment of flexible standards by which the efficiency of rural churches could be judged and their programs tested; (3) the better adaptation of the country church to the technical, economic, and social conditions of farm life; and (4) the inspiration and training of country ministers for more effective service in country communities.¹²

SCOPE AND METHOD OF THIS STUDY

This study of the rural church is based on data gathered by the writer for the church year of 1936 or 1937 from fifty ministers and three lay preachers serving fifty-nine churches in the Palouse Country of eastern Washington. All the churches are in Whitman County, which is practically coterminous with the Palouse River drainage area. This area is generally known throughout the Pacific Northwest as the "Palouse Country."¹³ Whitman is a very large county, being about sixty miles long and fifty miles wide and embracing over 2,100 square miles of territory.

¹² See the following bulletins: J. W. Strout, "The Rural Problem and the Country Minister" and M. B. Barnard, "Problems and Opportunities of Country Life" (Boston: American Unitarian Association); W. N. Green, "The Church and Rural Life" (New York: National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church); E. M. Smith and M. R. Hamm, "Will Baptists Share in the Rebuilding of Rural America?" (New York: The American Baptist Home Mission Society); R. G. Armstrong, "What of the Rural Church" (New York: Board of Home Missions of Congregational and Christian Churches); "The Church and the Agricultural Situation" (New York: The Home Missions Council); "A National Program for the Rural Church" (New York: The Home Missions Council); "The Country Church in the Kingdom of God" (Easton, Pennsylvania: Moravian Country Church Commission); "Four Country Churches of Distinction" (New York: Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.); "A Guide for Working Together in the Small Church" (Nashville, Tennessee: The Board of Christian Education, Methodist-Episcopal Church South); T. A. Tripp, "Rural People and the Church" (New York: Council for Social Action of Congregational and Christian Churches).

¹³ The Palouse Country is named for the tribe of Indians who inhabited the country before the coming of the white settlers. See C. C. Todd, "Origin and Meaning of the Geographic Name Palouse," *Washington Historical Quarterly*, XXIV (1933), pp. 190-02.

The county is essentially an agricultural county. The twenty villages and small towns in the county are almost exclusively agricultural trading centers, with the exception of Pullman, in which is located the State College of Washington. No town in the county exceeded 3,400 population in 1930. For purposes of this study, the whole area of the county, including open country, villages, and towns, may be regarded as essentially rural territory. All the churches in the villages and towns have farmer members. The only two towns in the county having populations in excess of 2,500 in 1930 were Pullman and Colfax, but the population of both these towns was less than 3,400. The fifty-nine churches serving farmers, villagers, and townsmen present a distinctly rural church situation.

The United States Census classifies as *rural* territory open country and all places containing less than 2,500 population, and as *urban* all places of 2,500 population and over. According to this census classification, the fifteen churches located in Colfax and Pullman are urban churches, and the forty-four churches located in the open country and in villages and towns of less than 2,500 are rural churches.

For various comparisons, however, the churches in this study have also been grouped under another classification: (1) churches in the open country and small villages of less than 200 population; (2) churches in the large villages from 200 to 1,000 population; and (3) churches in towns of over 1,000 population.

The data on the churches were obtained by the writer through personal interviews with the ministers. A three-page mimeographed schedule was used to record the data. The chief items of information obtained by the schedules and interviews concerned membership, programs, and finances of the church; and training, experience, activities and attitudes of ministers. Other original sources of information were the annual reports of several of the denominations having a number of churches in the area. It was not possible for the writer to see all the ministers in the county, as a number of them were absent at the time calls were made to see them. The survey includes about three-fourths of the churches in the county.

The purpose of the study was to find out the status of the church in a typical rural area of the Pacific Northwest. When the study was begun, it was hoped that recent trends in the rural church could be ascertained also; but it was found that the ministers were unable to

give information that would show trends over a period of years, even as much as half a decade.

HISTORIC, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND

In recent years it has become increasingly recognized that an adequate understanding of the church requires that it be studied in relation to the historic, economic, and social background of the people who compose its membership. The characteristics and development of the churches of a people are related to their historical origins; to their general culture, to the natural resources and topographical features of the territory they inhabit; to the occupations they follow; and to the education, political, and demographic conditions under which they live.¹⁴

Some sociologists hold that the church is a secondary and adaptive institution, taking many of its characteristics from the basic primary industrial folkways and mores of the people—the ways in which they make a living, their methods of producing and distributing economic goods; their regard for property and its social regulation; and the various social classes which have emerged, as conditioned by wealth and income. The means of gaining a livelihood is considered by these writers as the primary interest of the rank and file of people. Religious ideas, ideals, and practices, therefore, are to a considerable extent a reflection of the basic primary industrial mores.¹⁵ It is not the purpose of this article to deny or defend this extreme position of economic and social determinism of church growth and development. However, an attempt is made to show the relation between the rural church in Whit-

¹⁴ H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), Clifford Kirkpatrick, *Religion in Human Affairs* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1929), Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Church*, 2 vols. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), H. P. Douglass and E. deS. Brunner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935), H. K. Rowe, *The History of Religion in the U. S.* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924); W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930); S. J. Case, *Social Origins of Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), C. A. Ellwood, *Christianity and Social Science* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (London: Murray, 1926), A. L. Swift, Jr., *New Frontiers of Religion* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938).

¹⁵ A. G. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, Rev. Ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), Chap. XI; W. G. Sumner, *Folkways* (New York: Ginn and Co., 1906), F. R. Yoder, *Introduction to Sociology* (Pullman, Washington: The Department of Sociology, 1938, mimeographed), Chaps. XVII and XVIII.

man County and the general economic and social development of the county.

Whitman County is one of the richest agricultural counties in the United States. It was a vast prairie covered with tall bunch grass when occupied by settlers from 1870 to 1890. The top soil is a rich, dark loam, formed over a period of thousands of years by the annual decadence of the luxurious growth of bunch grass. The land, in spite of being rolling and hilly, is now farmed by heavy tractors, gang plows, and harvesting combines. Though much of the land was devoted to stock-raising in the earlier days, and much live-stock is still kept on farms today, wheat has become the principal product of the area. In 1930 over 80 per cent of the crop land was devoted to wheat raising.

When the land was opened for settlement in the early 'seventies, there was a rush to it by people from all sections of the United States. The great majority of the people were native Americans, coming mostly from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee, with a small sprinkling from several other states. In the late 'eighties and during the 'nineties many foreign-born people came into the county. In 1910, when all the farm land had been taken up and the population had reached its maximum, 10 per cent of the population was foreign-born white, and 18.7 per cent of foreign-born or mixed parentage. The major foreign-born groups in the order of numbers were: Germans, Russians, Canadians, English, Swedes, Swiss, and Norwegians.¹⁸ The heterogeneous population of the county has undoubtedly encouraged the growth of extreme denominationalism.

Trends in the population of the county between 1880 and 1930 are shown in Table I. The population increased rapidly each decade from

Table I Population of Whitman County, Washington, 1880-1930

	1930	1920	1910	1900	1890	1880
Total Population	28,014	31,323	33,280	25,360	19,109	7,014
Rural Population	21,910	28,296	27,895	25,360		
Urban Population	6,104	3,027	5,385			
Rural-Farm Pop	12,613					
Rural-Nonfarm Pop	9,297					
Per cent Rural	78.2	90.3	83.8	100.0		
Per cent Urban	21.8	9.7	16.2			

¹⁸ *Abstract of the Census 1910* (Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1913), p. 600.

1880 to 1910. Since 1910 the population has been decreasing. Not only has the farming population steadily declined during the last thirty years, owing largely to the use of power machinery and an increase in the size of farms, but most of the twenty villages and towns also showed a decrease in population during this period.

Of the total population of 28,014 in 1930, 21,910 was rural and 6,104 urban, according to the Census classification. The rural population of 21,910 was divided between 12,613 rural-farm population (persons living on farms) and 9297 rural non-farm population (persons living in villages and towns with less than 2,500 inhabitants). Only two towns, Colfax and Pullman, had populations in excess of 2,500 in 1930.

Agriculture is the basic industry of Whitman County. The division of labor in all modern communities, however, has become so complex and so many persons in the personal-service, middle-man, and professional occupations are required to serve these communities, that Whitman County had less than half of its 10,373 gainfully employed persons engaged in agriculture in 1930. According to the Census of that year, the number of persons in each of the major occupations in the county were: agriculture, 4,591; professional and semi-professional, 1,092; trade, 861; domestic and personal service, 542; railroads, 524; building industries, 305; hotels, restaurants, boarding houses, etc., 289; garages, filling and greasing stations, 280; construction and maintenance of streets and roads, 142; telegraph and telephone, 116; public service, 116; postal service, 102.¹⁷ Even though the county is essentially rural, its occupational structure is relatively complex. Though definite social stratification based on wealth and income has not developed to any notable degree, it is to be observed as having its beginnings. Many of the families in the towns are in the low income group.¹⁸

In Table II are shown the trends in the number and size of farms in Whitman County from 1900 to 1935. There has been a decrease in the number of farms and a corresponding increase in the average size of farms during this period. Whereas only 17.7 per cent of all farms contained 500 acres and over in 1900, 32.2 per cent of the farms were in this class in 1935, and whereas 43.5 per cent of the farms were under 175 acres in 1900, fewer than 30 per cent were in this class in

¹⁷ *Population*, Vol. 3, Part 2, *15th Census* (Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1932), p. 1235.

¹⁸ In 1933 and 1934 about 600 families in the county were on relief. Information from the County Welfare Office.

Table II. Farms by Size, Whitman County, Washington, 1900-35

	Number				
	1935	1930	1920	1910	1900
All farms	2751	2631	2957	3096	3081
Under 3 acres	15	15	1	12	16
3 to 9 acres	204	111	76	58	44
10 to 19 acres	120	92	75	82	34
20 to 49 acres	144	123	137	133	102
50 to 99 acres	131	136	142	197	211
100 to 174 acres	292	289	462	653	936
175 to 259 acres	256	255	356	345	324
260 to 499 acres	703	738	965	951	871
500 to 999 acres	606	606	543	502	387
1000 and over acres	280	266	200	163	156

	Percentages				
	1935	1930	1920	1910	1900
All farms	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 3 acres	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.5
3 to 9 acres	7.4	4.2	2.6	1.9	1.4
10 to 19 acres	4.4	3.5	2.5	2.6	1.1
20 to 49 acres	5.2	4.7	4.6	4.3	3.3
50 to 99 acres	4.8	5.2	4.8	6.4	6.8
100 to 174 acres	10.6	11.0	15.6	21.1	30.4
175 to 259 acres	9.3	9.7	12.0	11.1	10.5
260 to 499 acres	25.6	28.1	32.6	30.7	28.3
500 to 999 acres	22.0	23.0	18.3	16.2	12.6
1000 and over	10.1	10.1	6.8	5.3	5.1

1935. Improved farm machinery has brought an increase in the size of farms and a reduction in the number of farms, and one of the social results has been a declining farm population.

The large-scale operations of the Whitman County farmers are shown in Table III, in which a comparison is made among the Whitman County farmer and farmers in the state of Washington, the Pacific Division, and the United States in the average value of farm property. A glance at this table shows the superiority of the Whitman County farmer in the average value of total farm property, land and buildings, implements and machinery, livestock, and dwellings. Whitman County farmers are ahead of most farmers in the United States in the amount of wealth per farmer invested in the farm enterprise.

Table III Average Value of Different Types of Farm Property, Whitman County, Washington, 1930

	Whitman County	Wash- ington	Pacific Division	United States
Total farm property	\$34,237	\$12,522	\$20,629	\$9,103
Land and buildings	30,719	10,911	18,431	7,614
Implements and machinery	2,118	712	874	525
Livestock	1,399	898	1,324	964
Dwellings	1,679	1,318	1,617	1,126

The high standard of living of the Whitman County farmer as compared with farmers in general throughout the United States may also be inferred from figures in Table IV, which shows the percentages of farmers having automobiles, telephones, water piped into dwellings and bathrooms, and dwellings lighted with electricity

Table IV Percentage of Farms with Modern Conveniences, 1930

	Whitman County	Wash- ington	Pacific Division	United States
Automobiles	86.4	71.6	75.1	58.0
Telephones	76.3	44.8	40.7	34.0
Water piped into dwelling	67.4	48.6	59.7	15.8
Water piped into bathroom	42.0	29.2	43.2	8.4
Dwellings lighted by electricity	24.8	48.0	52.9	13.4

The welfare of the rural church depends to a considerable extent on the residential stability of the farming population.¹⁹ The length of residence of Whitman County farmers on their farms is shown in Table V as given by the Census of Agriculture of 1935. Approximately one-third of the farmers have been on their farms less than five years, and a fifth less than three years.

Excessive farm tenancy is known to be an adverse factor for the welfare of the rural church. The extensive studies made by the Committee on Social and Religious Surveys showed that, when farm tenants exceeded one-fifth of the total number of farmers in a community, the church was unable to reach tenant families as successfully as owner families.²⁰ In Table VI is shown the trend in farm tenancy in Whitman

¹⁹ J. H. Kolb and E. deS. Brunner, *op cit*, p. 464.

²⁰ H. N. Morse and E. deS. Brunner, *Town and Country Church in the U. S.* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923), pp. 156-59.

Table V Years on Farms by Full Owners and Tenants, Whitman County, Washington

	Number			Per cent		
	All Farmers	Full Owners	Tenants	All Farmers	Full Owners	Tenants
Total number reporting	2083	1000	1083	100 0	100 0	100 0
Living on farms						
Under 1 year	229	65	164	11 0	6 5	15 1
1 year	137	41	96	6 6	4 1	8 9
2 years	108	31	77	5 2	3 1	7 1
3 years	104	39	65	5 0	3 9	6 0
4 years	84	31	53	4 0	3 1	4 9
5 years and over	1421	793	628	68 2	79 3	58 0

Table VI Percentage Distribution of Farms by Tenure of Operator, Whitman County, Washington, 1880-1930

Tenure of operator	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930
Owner	95 8	87 6	75 1	69 3	56 7	57 1
Tenant	4 2	12 4	24 4	29 2	42 0	41 8
Manager	—	—	5	1 5	1 3	1 1

County from 1880 to 1930 The fact that more than two-fifths of the farmers in the county are tenants is no doubt a factor contributing to the relatively low church membership in the county.

INFLUENCE OF PIONEER CONDITIONS

Pioneer frontier conditions have had important effects upon the church in the United States, especially the rural church.²¹ The rural church situation in Whitman County still bears the impress of the pioneer period. The county is removed only one generation from its original settlement. When the first settlers arrived in the county in the 'seventies and 'eighties, they were followed by traveling frontier representatives of the leading religious denominations, sent as home missionaries to occupy the field, to establish preaching points, to bring together the adherents of their own faiths, as well as to proselyte among others, and to organize congregations.

There was a rush among the representatives of all the denominations "to get in on the ground floor." Every village and town trading center was overchurched. In one village of less than 500 population,

²¹ P. G. Mode, *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923)

where three railroads crossed and where it was thought a large town would grow up quickly, fourteen denominations organized congregations or established preaching points. Out in the open country districts preaching points were also established in many of the one-room school-houses, where Sunday Schools had been organized, though only a few churches were built in the open country. Circuit riders and ministers from the villages and towns preached at these school houses. Annual campmeetings were also held in a number of the country districts.²² The chief effect of the denominational rivalry among the early pioneers has been overchurching.

In Table VII are shown the trends in the membership of the several denominations in the county from 1896 to 1926 according to figures compiled by the Bureau of the Census in its decennial reports on *Religious Bodies*. The table also shows the percentage of the total

Table VII. Membership of Denominations in Whitman County, 1896 to 1926

	1926	1916	1906	1896
Population (Total)*	31,323	33,280	25,360	19,109
Percentage of population who are church members	29.4	29.0	31.6	18.9
Members of all denominations	9,196	9,645	8,007	3,613
Adventist, Seventh Day	164	154		74
Baptist (Northern)	870	883	852	293
Churches of Christ	31	367		
Congregational Churches	498	631	582	192
Disciples of Christ	1,243	1,426	1,323	980
Evangelical Association		43		
Latter Day Saints		32		
Lutheran (Total)	878	436	84	38
Methodist	1,809	1,899	1,622	547
Free Methodist		94		13
Church of the Nazarene	102	74		
Presbyterian	131	664	121	191
Episcopal	232	195	105	20
Roman Catholic	2,074	2,194	1,299	778
United Brethren in Christ		139		487
All Other Bodies	777	414	2,019	
Federated Churches	387			

* Population for the decennial year preceding each religious census.

²² For the early religious situation in the county, see F. R. Yoder, "Pioneer Social Adaptation in the Palouse Country of Eastern Washington, 1870-90," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, VI (1938), pp. 152-54.

population that were church members at the different periods. Like all pioneer communities, the percentage of persons who were church members in 1896 was very low—only 18.9. The percentage increased to 31.6 in 1906 and has remained slightly under 30.0 since then.

Between 1916 and 1926 there were noticeable decreases in membership in the following denominations: the Church of Christ, the Baptist (Northern), the Congregational, the Disciples of Christ, and the Presbyterian. Some of these decreases were due to federation. In the course of his survey, the writer was told of twenty churches which had been abandoned or in which preaching services were not being held any longer. Practically all the abandoned churches were in the hamlets and small villages. One cannot ascertain how many country preaching points have been discontinued in recent years, but the number seems to be large. Decrease in population, the shift of population from the open country to the villages and towns, automobile transportation and various Sunday amusements and attractions have all been factors contributing to the decline of the rural church in the open country and smaller places. The rural churches in most of the nation have been undergoing a similar change during the last two decades ²²

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP TODAY

Though all the fifty-nine churches included in this survey are regarded as essentially rural churches, because they serve farm families and a distinctly agricultural county, for purposes of comparison they have been divided into three groups as already indicated above: (1) those located in the open country and in villages of less than 200 population; (2) those located in villages with a population ranging from over 200 to 1,000 population; and (3) those located in towns of more than 1,000 population.

As shown in Table VIII, the average number of members in all the fifty-nine churches was 110; in the 13 open-country and small-village churches, 57; in the 23 large-village churches, 121; and in the 23 town churches, 128. The church membership figures are for persons over 13 years of age. The percentage of church members who were from farms was 51.5 for all the churches, 89.3 for the open-country and small-village churches, 74.0 for the large-village churches, and 20.6 for the town churches.

²²I. M. Gillette, *op cit*, pp. 415-17; N. L. Sims, *op. cit*, pp 519-38

Table VIII. Churches and Church Membership by Location, Whitman County, Washington

	Number of Churches	Number of Members	Number of Farm Members	Per cent of Farm Members	Average Number of Members
In all places	59	6511	3353	51.5	110
In open-country and small villages of less than 200	13	750	670	89.3	57
In large villages of 200 to 1000	23	2800	2072	74.0	121
In towns over 1000	23	2961	611	20.6	128

In the fifty-nine churches included in the survey the range in members was from nine to 604. The distribution of churches by different sizes of membership was as follows:

Under 25	6	76 to 100	12
26 to 50	13	101 to 200	8
51 to 75	11	over 200	8

Four churches in the county, two Methodist and two Catholic, had memberships in excess of 300. The churches having very small memberships are chiefly among the Nazarene, Free Methodist, and Pentecostal denominations, and are relatively new churches in the county. Nearly one-fourth of the churches have a membership of less than 50, and more than half the churches a membership of less than 75. This small membership means weak churches, unable to finance a program adequate for a modern church and to meet the minimum standards set up by rural church authorities for an effective modern rural church.²⁴

The average membership in the rural churches in the county, according to the Census classification for rural territory, was 95, as compared with an average of 115 for the United States as a whole, 106 for the Pacific Division, and 75 for Washington, as shown by the religious survey of the Bureau of the Census for 1926.²⁵

²⁴ See the new standards for rural churches suggested by E. deS. Brunner, *Tested Methods in Town and Country Churches* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923), *passim*; E. E. Sundt, *The Country Church and Our Generation* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1932); Margaret W. Teague, *Forward into Rural America* (New York: The National Council, Protestant Episcopal Churches, undated); E. A. Roadman, *The Country Church and Its Program* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1925); E. deS. Brunner, *The Larger Parish* (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934); "A National Program for the Rural Church" (New York: Home Missions Council, 1938).

²⁵ *Religious Bodies, 1926*, Vol. I (Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1930), p. 132.

The membership of the Pentecostal, Nazarene, and Free Methodist churches which have been established rather recently in the country appears to be drawn rather largely from the working class in the towns, and from farm laborers and tenants in the country. The establishment of these churches in already overchurched communities seems to indicate that their members have not felt entirely at home in the older churches of middle-class farmers and townsmen. Students of church history have pointed out the tendency of new sects to arise in communities with trends toward social stratification. The church membership structure of a community tends to adapt itself to the social and class composition of the population.³⁶ This process of class adaptation of the churches seems to be in progress in Whitman County to a mild degree.

Though only 45 per cent of the population of the county lived on farms in 1930, the proportion of members of the fifty-nine churches living on farms was 51.5 per cent. Measured in terms of church membership, the farm population appears to be somewhat more religious than the non-farm population. In the open country and small villages 89.3 per cent of the church members lived on farms, in the villages 74.0 per cent, and in the towns 20.6 per cent. These figures show that farmers and their families are well represented in both the large village and the town churches in the county. About four times as many farm church members worship in large village and town churches as worship in the open country and small village churches. With good roads and automobiles, farmers go to the large villages and towns for worship as well as for trade, recreation, and schools.

PRESENT TREND IN CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Most of the ministers from whom the church membership figures were obtained were unable to give specific figures on the trend in church membership from 1930 to 1936 or 1937. But according to estimates given by the ministers, about half the churches had increased in membership during this period, about one-fourth had declined, and about one-fourth had remained stationary. In the thirteen open-country and small-village churches only one reported an increase in membership, whereas two reported a decreasing, and ten a stationary, membership.

³⁶ H. R. Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, Chs. II, III, IV, VIII, H. P. Douglass and E. deS. Bruhner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935), pp. 237-303, A. L. Swift, *op. cit.*, Parts II and III.

In the large-village churches nine reported an increasing, nine a decreasing, and five a stationary, membership. In the towns, eighteen churches reported increases, two decreases, and three no changes in membership between 1930 and 1936 or 1937. The tendency for churches in the open country and small villages to decline in membership, and for those in the large villages and towns to increase is another phase of the adjustment of the churches in the county to widening transportation, economic, and social areas, a tendency which has been observed in other parts of the country.²⁷

As a check against the foregoing estimates of the trend in church membership in Whitman County, the conference reports of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the Pacific Northwest were examined for trends in membership in eleven charges in the county from 1930 to 1936. The total "full membership" and the average for the eleven charges from 1930 to 1936, were found to be as follows²⁸:

Year	Total Membership	Average Membership
1930	1322	120
1931	1294	117
1932	1432	130
1933	1597	145
1934	1487	135
1935	1491	135
1936	1566	142

These figures show that there was an upward trend in church membership in these eleven charges from 1930 to 1936. There has been considerable discussion among church papers and ministers as to the influence of the great economic depression of the early 'thirties on church membership. Some persons have contended that during the period of the depression many persons became more interested in religion and helped to increase church membership, attendance, and support. Others have contended just the opposite, that many people lost interest in religion and church affairs during the worries of the depression, dropped their membership, and ceased to attend and support churches. Such quantitative data as are available for throwing light on this question for all parts of the country are not conclusive as to the

²⁷ J. H. Kolb and E. deS. Brunner, *op cit*, pp 462-71, J. M. Gillette, *op. cit.*, pp 414-17.

²⁸ *Annual Reports of the Pacific Northwest Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1930-36.*

actual effects produced on the churches by a prolonged financial depression.²⁹

An interesting observation to the writer during the survey was how few of the ministers had ever studied the specific trends in the membership of their churches for as much as a decade or even half a decade, and how indifferent most of them appeared to be about membership trends in their own churches. Several ministers who were pressed for figures on specific trends in church membership for half a dozen years back showed considerable irritation and suggested to the writer that if he wanted such information he should try to get it from the national or district headquarters of their churches. There seemed to be a lack of feeling of any personal responsibility on the part of ministers for trends in church membership. No doubt this seeming indifference about the trends in church membership on the part of many pastors was due in part to their relatively short periods of service in their churches.

Though information is not complete in this survey for the entire county, the writer, as stated above, learned of at least twenty churches, chiefly in small villages, which have been abandoned or in which regular preaching services have been discontinued within the last five years. Since the proportion of church members to the total population of the county has remained approximately the same for the last two decades, it would seem that some of the families which worshipped in the small-village churches have transferred their membership to the large-village and town churches. The automobile, good roads, extension of high school districts out into the country, the disappearance of country stores, and the increase in social contacts between farm and town people have no doubt been primary factors in the weakening and closing of a number of churches in the open country in Whitman County. This movement of farm church membership from the open country and small villages to large villages and towns has been observed throughout the United States during the last two decades. It is to be noted, however, that at least half a dozen strong, stable churches in Whitman County are in the open country and small villages. This shifting of farm church membership to the large villages and towns is another phase of the social adaptation of religious institutions to the changing primary factors of transportation, enlargement of farms, and multiplication of town-country relationships.

²⁹ S. C. Kincheloe, *Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1937).

VALUE OF CHURCH PROPERTY

The average value of churches and parsonages is shown in Table IX. Two congregations did not have church buildings of their own. Forty-three of the fifty-nine churches furnished parsonages for the

Table IX. Average Value of Church Buildings and Parsonages of 57 Congregations, Whitman County, Washington

	Church Buildings		Parsonages	
	Number	Average Value	Number	Average Value
All Congregations	57	\$8,238	43	\$2,592
Congregations in open country and small villages	12	\$4,475	8	\$2,262
Congregations in large villages	22	\$5,931	18	\$1,714
Congregations in towns	23	\$12,408	17	\$3,676

ministers. The range in value for church buildings in the open country and small villages was from \$1,000 to \$15,000, in the large villages, from \$700 to \$25,000; and in the towns, from \$1,300 to \$40,000. The range in the value of parsonages in the open country and small villages was from \$1,000 to \$4,000; in the large villages, from \$260 to \$4,500; and in the towns, from \$500 to \$8,000.

The average value of church buildings in the open country and places of less than 2,500 population (rural territory, according to the *Census* classification) in Whitman County was \$4,821 at the time of the survey as compared with \$6,198 for the whole United States, \$6,841 for the Pacific Division, and \$5,109 for Washington, according to the federal church Census of 1926.²⁰

Whereas sixteen of the twenty-three town churches were equipped with dining room and kitchen facilities for holding fellowship and dinner meetings, only five of the thirteen open-country and small-village churches and five of the twenty-three large-village churches were so equipped. Fewer than half the churches in Whitman County meet the "New Par-Standard" for country churches in providing an adequate kitchen and dining room for fellowship meetings.²¹

²⁰ *Religious Bodies*, 1926, Vol I, p 139.

²¹ The "New-Par Standard" is an elaborate standard of fifty points for judging (1) the physical equipment, (2) the religious and missionary education, (3) the finances, (4) the pastor, (5) the program, and (6) the cooperation, of churches. The standard was worked out by rural church leaders of a number

CHURCH PROGRAMS

All the town churches have preaching services at least once a week. Seventeen of the twenty-three large-village churches have preaching services weekly, five fortnightly, and one irregularly. Eleven of the thirteen open-country and small-village churches have preaching services weekly, one irregularly, and another rarely.

Fifty-seven of the churches have Sunday Schools. The average enrollment and the average attendance of all Sunday Schools in each of the four types of community, together with the average attendance in percentages of the enrollments, are shown in Table X. The ratio

Table X Average Sunday School Enrollment and Attendance in Churches, Whitman County, Washington

	Average Sunday School Enrollment	Average Sunday School Attendance	Percentage of Enrollment Attending
Churches in all places	78 1	53 1	68 0
Churches in open country and small villages	68 8	54 8	79 7
Churches in large villages	63 2	41 9	66 3
Churches in towns	99 4	63 3	63 7

of attendance to enrollment was considerably larger in the open-country and small-village churches than in the large-village and town churches. Twenty-one churches reported an increase in Sunday School enrollment from 1930 to 1936, twelve a decrease, and twenty-four no change

Forty of the fifty-nine churches had young people's societies. Six of the thirteen open-country and small-village churches, eight of the twenty-three large-village churches, and five of the twenty-three town churches had no young people's organizations. The number of young people attending these societies in churches which had them ranged from eight to ten in the small churches to more than a hundred in several of the town churches. The three churches with over one hundred attending were in the town of Pullman, where many college students attend the young people's meetings. Most of the complaints from pastors about the indifference of young people to church work and attendance came from pastors serving congregations which do not have young people's societies. A relatively large number of the churches

of denominations, and has been quoted widely in books on the rural church and texts in rural sociology. See E deS Brunner, *Tested Methods in Town and Country Churches* (New York George H Doran Company, 1923), pp 166-69

in the county have not kept pace with the modern trend in church work which provides a special program for the young people in the church.

The churches in the county do very little in the way of sponsoring boys' and girls' clubs or groups. Only four churches were found sponsoring boys' groups, and only one a girls' group. Though there are many boys' and girls' groups (including Boy Scouts, Campfire, and Four-H Clubs) in the county, only a few of them are sponsored by the churches. None of the thirty-six open-country and small-village and the large-village churches sponsor these groups.

In women's auxiliary societies, the churches of the county do very well, forty-nine of the fifty-nine churches reporting such societies. But in only ten of the fifty-nine churches are there men's brotherhoods. Nineteen of the churches held general fellowship meetings during the year for all the members of the church and their families. Three churches held such meetings every two months, four every quarter, and twelve once or twice a year.

CHURCH BUDGET AND PASTORS' SALARIES

The average annual budget for all the fifty-nine churches was \$1,511; for the open-country and small-village churches, \$1,151; for the large-village churches, \$1,213; and for the town churches, \$2,012. The range in total budgets for the three groups of churches was as follows: open-country and small-village churches, \$20 to \$2,465; large-village churches, \$160 to \$5,388; and town churches, \$386 to \$6,332. The churches with extremely low budgets were served either by lay pastors who received little or no pay for their services, or were churches without regular pastors. In one church the lay pastor reported that he "preached for nothing, furnished the fuel, and did all the janitor work." In his village one church had just recently closed its doors. Seven miles away was a town with nine churches, but no church of his denomination. The little congregation still persisted with a mere handful of members, and the total annual budget raised by the church was \$20.

The distribution of churches by size of budget is shown in Table XI. More than two-thirds of the churches in Whitman County have total budgets that fall below the standard suggested by rural church leaders as necessary for the maintenance of an adequate church program.

Table XI. Distribution of Churches by Size of Budgets, Whitman County, Washington

Less than \$500	14
\$500 to \$999	12
\$1000 to \$1999	16
\$2000 to \$2999	10
\$3000 and over	7

The average amount paid by all the churches for pastors' salaries was slightly more than half of their total budget. For the open-country and small-village churches, however, the proportion for ministers' salaries was 75 per cent of the total budget.

Since nine of the fifty ministers receiving salaries preached in more than one church, the average salaries received by the ministers was not the same as the average amounts paid by the churches for ministers' salaries. Table XII shows the stipulated salaries of ministers and the salaries they actually received. All churches paid an average of 91 per cent of the stipulated salary to their ministers. The open-country and small-village churches paid ministers' salaries in full.

Table XII Average Salaries, Stipulated and Received, for Whitman County Ministers

	Amount Stipulated	Amount Received
All churches	\$ 854	\$779
Churches in open country and small villages	802	802
Churches in large villages	597	543
Churches in towns	1125	997

One of the outstanding facts brought out by the survey is the low salaries paid to ministers. The average salary for all the fifty paid ministers was \$854; for the open-country ministers, \$802; for the large-village ministers, \$579; and for the town ministers, \$1,125. Salaries ranged from \$250 to \$1,600 in the open country and small-village churches; from \$150 to \$1,050 in the large-village churches; and from \$300 to \$2,500 in the town churches. Seven ministers received salaries of less than \$300. One-fourth of the ministers received salaries of less than \$500, and half the ministers received salaries of less than \$750. Only two received salaries of \$2,000 and above, and only six salaries of \$1,500 and above. Ten of the regularly paid ministers reported that

they engaged in other occupations for part of their living. If the "New Par-Standard" of \$1,500 is taken as the minimum salary, which ought to be paid rural ministers to enable them to care for their families properly and meet the expenses necessary for continued education and professional development, forty-one of the fifty paid ministers in the county are receiving inadequate salaries.

Three men preaching and serving churches as leaders were laymen and received no stipulated salaries, preaching being only an avocation with them. One of these men reported that he received no pay of any kind for his services, and the two others stated that they received only free-will offerings when "the plate was passed around."

Eleven of the fifty-nine churches received mission aid from the outside. Four of these, however, were churches in the town of Pullman, which were churches serving college students as a part of their program. The other seven received aid ranging from \$80 to \$1,032, the average being \$329. One town church with twelve of its eighteen members living on farms was receiving 83 per cent of its total budget from the home mission board of its denomination. It is interesting to the student of rural church affairs to learn that in this very rich agricultural county seven churches have to be supported in part by funds sent in from the outside. It is probable that the subsidizing of churches in Whitman County by home mission boards of the various denominations today is a carry-over from the days when many of the churches were supported as mission points by these boards. This practice also seems to be a phase of denominational rivalry and jealousy which still prevails among a number of denominations.²²

EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING OF MINISTERS

Twenty-one of the fifty ministers reported that they had engaged in other kinds of work previous to taking up the ministry or during their ministry. Seven had been common, unskilled laborers, four teachers, two farmers, two carpenters, one a clerk, one a court reporter, one an editor, and one an insurance salesman. One very "resourceful" minister who was receiving a salary of less than \$500 and was much grieved because he had to send three per cent of the budget raised to help pay the salaries of several higher officials in his denomination, told the writer that he had "done most everything," including "work on the railroad as a section hand, section foreman, and fireman," and

²² P. G. Mode, *op cit*, Chaps. V and VI.

proudly explained that he had come into the ministry as a "salesman and broker, preaching on the side, and getting my own congregations together on the streets on Saturday nights in the towns in which I was staying." Though sixty-seven years old, he stated that he had no fears for the future if he should be turned out of his denomination for truculency and refusal to meet the demands made on him by his superiors, because he "could pick up a job at most any kind of machinery."

The fifty ministers ranged in age from 21 to 74, the average for all of them being 47.3. The average age for the open-country and small-village ministers was 50.9; for the large-village ministers, 40.2; and for the town ministers, 44.2. Four of the ten open-country and small-village ministers were over 60 years of age, two of the twenty-one large-village ministers were over 60, and two of the twenty town ministers were over 60. It seems to be true in Whitman County as in other parts of the country that the older men tend to gravitate to the strictly rural areas. On the other hand, the large villages have younger ministers than the towns have. Many of the ministers in the large villages are young men just getting started in the ministry, eight of them being less than thirty. On the other hand, the city churches with their higher salaries attract more experienced ministers, only two of the twenty town ministers being less than thirty and only seven less than forty.

Forty of the fifty ministers had attended college, six had attended high school, and four had attended only the elementary school. Twenty-two of the fifty ministers held college degrees. The forty college-trained ministers had attended college an average of 3.5 years. Five of the ten open-country and small-village ministers had attended college an average of 1.8 years, fifteen of the twenty large-village ministers an average of 2.7 years, and nineteen town ministers an average of 3.8 years. Nine of the ten ministers who had not attended college were preaching in the open-country and small-village and large-village churches.

Forty-two of the ministers had attended seminaries an average of 2.8 years each. Five of the ten ministers in the open-country and small-village churches had spent an average of 2.6 years in seminaries; fifteen of the twenty ministers in the large-village churches, an average of 3.3 years; and seventeen of the twenty ministers in the towns an average of 3.1 years. Four ministers reported that they had taken ministerial correspondence courses. Eleven of the fifty ministers held divinity degrees.

The number of years preached by the ministers ranged from one to forty-five. The average for the fifty ministers was 17.4 years. The average for the ten open-country and small-village ministers was 22.2 years, for the large-village ministers, 13.6 years; and for the town ministers, 19.1 years. The average number of years preached in the pulpits occupied at the time of the survey was 4.4 for the open-country and small-village ministers, 2.7 for the large-village ministers, and 3.8 for the town ministers.

The ministers included in the survey were on the whole not inclined to belong to organizations other than those directly connected with their ministry. Only twenty of the fifty belonged to any kind of secular organization. Six were members of lodges, ten members of commercial clubs, five members of service clubs, and four members of the Grange. One belonged to the Townsend Club in his town and one to the Northwest Writers' Club. The majority of the ministers seem to remain aloof from community activities rather than to participate in them. In one small village where three much underpaid ministers were struggling to keep three declining churches alive, the writer found the county Pomona Grange in session on the day he interviewed the three ministers, but none of the three ministers was a member of the local Grange. A large number of cars of Grange members were parked around the new Grange Hall. When asked by the writer why so many cars were in the village, one minister remarked, "I'm not sure what the commotion is about, but I think it's some kind of farmers' meeting." Another minister in the village, lamenting the lack of interest in the church, pointing to the Grange Hall and the cars parked around it, said, "If they [the farmers] were as much interested in the church as they are in that thing over there, the churches wouldn't have such a hard time." That there might be some advantage to the pastors in their rural ministry in belonging to the Grange and getting acquainted with the Grangers and their program seemed never to have occurred to these pastors, who knew their own churches were losing members and becoming weaker every year.

The fifty ministers reported that they divided their time just about equally between preparing their sermons and attending to ministerial duties, such as calling on members, meetings with committees, and looking after church business. The average amount of time per week spent on sermons was 14.6 hours, and the average amount of time in other ministerial duties was 14.4. Seventeen of the fifty ministers,

however, reported that they spent an average of 18.2 hours a week doing other things than those connected with their ministry. The low salaries received by a number of the ministers compelled them to engage in other occupations to support their families.

WHAT THE MINISTERS READ

Forty-seven of the fifty ministers read daily newspapers, seven of these reading two dailies, and one three. Only twenty-five of the fifty ministers read a local weekly newspaper circulating in their community, village, or town. The failure of half the ministers to read a local weekly newspaper, when there is no local daily in the county, shows the lack of community interest on their part and a lack of appreciation of the relationships between their churches and the communities in which they preached.

Though the primary business enterprise of Whitman County is agriculture and all the churches serve farming populations as part of their constituency, only eleven of the ministers read a farm journal of any kind. Five of these read the *Country Gentleman*, four the *Farm Journal*, one the *Washington Farmer*, and one *Wallace's Farmer*.

In their reading of religious papers and journals the ministers showed a decided preference for publications of their own denomination. Forty-eight of the fifty read an average of more than three publications each of this kind. The number of ministers reading varying numbers of denominational publications was as follows:

Seven	2	Three	17
Six	2	Two	9
Five	5	One	10
Four	3	None	2

In addition to their own denominational papers and magazines six ministers read the *Christian Century*, four *Church Management*, and three the *Homiletic Review*.

The fifty ministers reported reading twenty-two different secular weekly and monthly magazines. The number of ministers reading the different magazines was as follows:

<i>Reader's Digest</i>	18	<i>Harper's Magazine</i>	3
<i>Literary Digest</i>	6	<i>Saturday Evening Post</i>	3
<i>The American</i>	5	<i>Liberty</i>	3
<i>The Atlantic Monthly</i>	4	<i>Scribner's Magazine</i>	2
<i>Time</i>	4	<i>Life</i>	2
<i>Newsweek</i>	3		

Other magazines reported as being read by one minister each were the *New Republic*, the *Nation*, the *Review of Reviews*, *World Events*, *Poetry*, *Colliers*, *Lloyd's*, the *Sunset Magazine*, the *National Geographic*, the *Commentator*, and the *Manchester Guardian*.

The ministers interviewed were asked two questions in regard to the books they had read: (1) "What books have you read in the last two years?" and (2) "What books have you found most helpful to you in the ministry?" Naturally a great variety of books was reported. An attempt has been made by the author to classify the various books listed by the ministers in reply to the two questions. The number of each of the various kinds of books read during the last two years was as follows:

1 Belief, faith, dogma, salvation	66	9 Christianity and social	
2 Christ and His teachings	40	problems	6
3 The church and religion	26	10 Secular biography	6
4 Preaching and the ministry	13	11 Books on the Bible	5
5 Psychology and religion	11	12 Secular history	5
6 General literature	11	13 Travel	4
7 Religious leaders	11	14 Missions	4
8. Social problems	11	15 Ethics and philosophy	4

As to the books that had been found most useful to the pastors in their ministry, the number and order by classes were as follows:

1 Belief, faith, dogma, salvation	36	10 Christianity and social	
2 Christ and His teachings	24	problems	8
3 General literature	24	11 The church and religion	8
4 Religious leaders	15	12 Collections of sermons	7
5 Books on the Bible	15	13 Secular history	7
6 Commentaries	13	14 Social problems	4
7 Preaching and the ministry	13	15 Secular biography	2
8. Ethics and philosophy	10	16 Travel	2
9. Psychology and religion	9	17 Missions	1

Nine ministers reported they had read no new books during the last two years before they were interviewed. Nine more had read only two or three books each. Ten had read five or six each. More than half the ministers had not read as many as six new books in the two years preceding the interview. Only nine of the fifty ministers had read as many as five new books a year in the preceding two years.

The two classified and ranked lists of books given above show that the ministers of Whitman County, so far as their reading is concerned, have been primarily interested in strictly religious subjects. Of course,

it is to be expected that ministers would do most of their reading in the field of religion. The relatively small number of books read on general cultural subjects and social problems, however, shows how little connection the ministers see between the church and the social order. Since the beginning of the present century many leaders in Christian work in the United States have emphasized the challenge of the present social order to the church and the ministry.³³ Especially have the vital relations between the rural church and the social problems of the rural community been stressed.³⁴ But as judged by what they read, only a small number of Whitman County ministers seem to have much appreciation of the relationship between their churches and the social situation of the people they serve. Though all the ministers have farm members in their churches and the majority of them more than half their members from farms, not a minister interviewed in the survey mentioned a book in rural sociology, rural economics, or the rural church in the list of books he had read. Though practically all the ministers had felt sharply the effects of a great economic depression on their churches, only one had been interested enough to read a book dealing with the depression and its social consequences.

SUBJECTS EMPHASIZED IN PREACHING

The ministers were asked what subjects or special phases of religion they emphasized in their sermons. Such a wide variety of subjects was given that they were rather difficult to classify. A rough classification of topics made by the writer in the order of the number of times mentioned is as follows:

1	Belief, doctrine, salvation	47
2	Christianity and personal living	21
3	Christianity and social problems	21
4	Evangelism	17

³³ See such books as Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913), *Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1917); H. F. Ward, *Social Evangelism* (New York: Missionary Education Movement, 1915); C. A. Ellwood, *The Reconstruction of Religion* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922), *Christianity and Social Science* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923); S. J. Case, *Social Origins of Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923); J. H. Holmes, *New Churches and Old* (Dodd, Mead and Company, 1922); C. C. McCown, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929); and D. C. Macintosh, *Social Religion* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939).

³⁴ See the list of books on the rural church cited in note 5.

5. The Bible	15
6. Jesus	6
7. Missions	3
8. Modernism	2

Eleven ministers stated that they "avoided preaching the social gospel," and three said they "avoided discussing theology." No minister interviewed in the survey mentioned giving special attention to rural church problems in his sermons.

MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEMS OF MINISTERS

The ministers were asked what were their most difficult problems. A classification of answers in the order of the number of times mentioned shows what the ministers consider their most difficult problems:

1 Indifference of people to religion	20
2 Lack of interest in spiritual matters	17
3 Poor attendance of members	12
4 Financing the church	10
5 Holding the young people	8
6 Meeting competition of other agencies	5
7 Inadequate training of ministry for work.....	5
8 Lack of well-trained Sunday School teachers.....	3
9 Interesting both young and old	2
10. Getting cooperation of other denominations.....	2

Other problems mentioned by one minister each were: relating religion to everyday life; clannishness among church members; satisfying varied personal needs; getting church attendance in winter when roads were muddy; prorating church funds to local pastor, the superintendent, and the bishop; getting the church building paid for; mixed marriages—persons of one denomination with those of another; lack of a common historical background among members; and a changing and shifting population. One minister stated that his church "had no difficult problems of any kind"; and another explained that the people of his congregation got along all right "if they were properly directed."

Asked how they thought their difficult church problems could be solved, most of the ministers stated that they did not know. A classification of the replies of those who had suggestions to make is as follows:

1. More emphasis on strictly religious and spiritual programs	13
2. More responsibility on church members	11

3. Movements toward church cooperation and unity	10
4. Better and more inspiring ministers	9
5. Community programs for the church	5
6. More applied Christianity	2

Other suggestions by one minister each were: avoidance of politics and social questions; better business methods in the church; more modernistic thinking; more equity in ministers' salaries; and getting rid of "revivalism." One minister suggested letting "time solve the church problems." Another hoped that "something new will come along"; another thought "church problems will be solved by One greater than myself"; and another stated, "I wish I did know the answer."

CHURCH COOPERATION AND UNION

On the question of church cooperation and union, the ministers expressed one or more attitudes and various combinations of attitudes ranging from enthusiastic approval of both cooperation and union to positive disapproval of both cooperation and union. The number of ministers expressing different attitudes and different combinations of attitudes on this question was as follows:

1 Favoring cooperation, but not union ..	22
2 Favoring both cooperation and union	21
3 Opposed to both cooperation and union	15
4 Doubtful about both cooperation and union ...	10
5 Favoring cooperation in local matters	10
6 See need of cooperation, but doubt feasibility...	9

Asked what they thought were the chief obstacles of church cooperation and union, the ministers specified the following factors the number of times indicated:

1 Intolerance and misunderstanding	25
2 Basic differences in beliefs and creeds	20
3 Denominational prejudices	18
4 Vested interest among clergy in their positions	12

SOCIAL LAG IN THE CHURCHES

An American sociologist has pointed out the tendency of the non-material phases of a people's culture to lag behind the developments in their material culture, because of such factors as the difficulties of making new social inventions, the vested interests of persons holding responsible positions in social organizations, the power of tradition and

habit, and the social pressure of the opponents of social change.³⁵ In Whitman County the sociological observer and student sees a progressive farm life in many respects. In the use of machinery, scientific methods of cultivation, pure-bred livestock and selected varieties of crop plants, Whitman County farmers are probably not exceeded by other farmers in any part of the country. The third generation of farmers is now building a superior type of farm home equipped with all modern conveniences. Good highways have been or are being built into most of the communities of the county. A large percentage of farm families are active in the Granges. Consolidation of rural schools is now taking place rapidly. Practically all rural children of high school age are in the high schools. Many farm families are sending their older children to college. Almost everything in farm life has moved ahead rapidly in the last two decades.

Most of the rural churches, however, fail to meet the standards set up by rural church leaders that would enable them to serve country and village people efficiently in the modern age. The greatest weakness is the small size of most church units. Students of the rural church have stated that one church to about 1,000 population is the proper proportion if the church unit is to be large enough to get the financial support it needs and to pay and attract the kind of pastors who can make a strong appeal to progressive rural people.³⁶ According to this norm of students and leaders of the rural church, Whitman County is probably three or four times overchurched. All the rural ministers in the county recognize this fact. But how the present situation is to be remedied seems to be most puzzling to them. The ministers are disposed to blame their own church members and "the other ministers" for the present situation of great overchurching. The fact that most of the ministers are aware of the overchurched condition in the county is probably the first step toward remedying the situation.

A retired farmer in one of the small villages of less than 500 population succinctly and profanely summarized the church situation in his community from the point of view of a hard-headed laymen. The writer had spotted three churches in the community, and, seeing this farmer mowing his lawn, asked whether there were any more churches

³⁵ W. F. Ogburn, *Social Change* (New York: The Viking Press, 1922), Part III

³⁶ H. N. Morse and E. deS. Brunner, *The Town and Country Church in the United States* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923), p. 73

in the village. The farmer quickly replied: "H--- no; they hain't got enough in all three they have now to make one good church."

Some half a dozen church unions between different denominations have taken place in the county in the last two decades. This is slow progress in a movement that seems necessary for the earthly salvation of many small churches. It has been hoped by many that a new generation of rural ministers will be willing to work more zealously for church cooperation and union in the open country, villages, and small towns, where it is so much needed. Leadership in church union seems to be the large challenge to the young ministers serving the churches of Whitman County today²⁷

²⁷ For discussion of problems and methods of uniting country and small-town churches, see E. R. Hooker, *United Churches* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926); *How Can Local Churches Come Together* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1928); E. deS. Brunner, *The Larger Parish—A Movement or an Enthusiasm* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934); Malcolm Dana, *The Larger Parish* (New York: Congregational Church Extension Board, 1938); and Henry Israel, *Y. M. C. A. in Town and Country* (New York: Association Press, 1929).

THE PREPARATION OF GALACTURONIC AND MUCIC ACIDS FROM PECTIC SUBSTANCES¹

HUGH H. MOTTERN

*Chemist, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, U. S. D. A.
Fruit and Vegetable By-Products Laboratory, Pullman, Washington*

The nomenclature of the pectic substances and the literature concerning their composition was reviewed. Because of the lack of definite knowledge concerning the composition of pectic substances, their nomenclature has not followed any regular plan and is often confusing. It is difficult, therefore, to reconcile the results of various workers.

¹ Abstract of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry, State College of Washington (1939). Published in part as "Enzymic Preparation of d-Galacturonic Acid," *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, LXI (1939), 2701.

The thesis of which this is an abstract has been issued through Auxiliary Publication and may be obtained as Document 1291 from the non-profit Bibliofilm Service, in care of U. S. Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D.C., for \$1.14 for a copy in microfilm, which can be conveniently read enlarged full size on reading machines now widely available.

A table was presented, based on the system of the American Chemical Society, but containing more data regarding chemical composition and adding two new classes: pectinic acid and polygalacturonic acid. These appear to be sufficiently characterized to warrant their addition to the present system.

A study of the composition of the pectic substances—starting with the simplest body, galacturonic acid, and proceeding to the more complex substances—resulted in the conclusion that pectin is essentially a linear high-molecular-weight polymer of galacturonic acid with the carboxyl groups more or less esterified with methyl alcohol, and with the arabinose and galactose occurring in a side chain if attached to the polymer.

A quantity of galacturonic acid was desired for studies of its possible physiological action. Available methods used pectic substances of indefinite composition, involved complicated procedures, or gave low yields. A method was developed for the preparation of polygalacturonic acid (a polymer consisting only of galacturonic acid units) and for its enzymic hydrolysis to α -d-galacturonic acid. The enzymic hydrolysis of commercially available polygalacturonic acid by commercially available pectinase enzyme preparations gave a simple, satisfactory method for preparing galacturonic acid on a laboratory scale and would be readily adaptable to commercial scale operation if desired. The possibility of producing galacturonic acid by mold fermentation was investigated, but in view of the adaptability of the enzyme method, mold fermentation was considered to be at a disadvantage.

The oxidation of galacturonic acid to mucic acid by nitric acid was investigated with a view of applying it to pectic substances. Galacturonic acid gave almost theoretical yields of mucic acid on oxidation with nitric acid, but its polymers gave low yields unless previously hydrolyzed as by enzyme action.

VIROSES OF THE GARDEN PEA (*PISUM SATIVUM* L.) IN WASHINGTON¹

FOLKE JOHNSON

This study has shown that there has been a severe decrease in the production of market-garden peas in this state the last two years because of several factors, of which the increased cost of production brought about by the need of combating plant diseases has become important. The results presented show that there are at least three viroous diseases of peas in this state which cause considerable damage to market-garden peas. The disease called enation mosaic causes a typical mosaic mottle of varying patterns, with an accompaniment of irregular outgrowths or enations on the under surface of the leaves; severe mosaic causes a severe mottling, dwarfing, and reduction in yield of pods; and streak causes wilting, severe necrosis of both leaves and pods, and the development of light brown to purplish streaks on the leaves. Inoculation tests—with the three pea viruses—have shown that streak and severe mosaic affect many species and varieties of legumes with some variation in the type and severity of symptoms, but that enation mosaic has a much more limited range of suscept. The three viruses may be distinguished from each other by their symptomologies produced on peas, longevities in vitro and in dried plant tissue, by their tolerance to dilution with water, and by their inactivation by heat. The virus causing enation mosaic was transmitted by mechanical means with difficulty, whereas the viruses causing severe mosaic and streak were readily transmitted by the same method. Attempts in artificial transmission of the viruses with pea aphids in the glasshouse of the Department of Plant Pathology were successful with enation mosaic and severe mosaic, but not with the virus causing streak. Field experiments did not reveal the origin of the viruses in the pea fields in the early spring. Seed transmission has been suggested, but detailed tests with 15,694 plants grown from seed either collected in areas where mosaic was abundant or from viruliferous plants showed only one

¹ Abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Plant Pathology, State College of Washington (1939). A portion of this dissertation has been included in the following publications:

Folke Johnson and L. K. Jones. Viroous Diseases of Peas. Abst in Phytopathology, XXVI (1936), 96.

Two Mosaic Diseases of Peas in Washington. Journal of Agricultural Research, LIV (1937), 629-638.

infected plant (severe mosaic) which could have originated from seed. Additional experiments failed to transfer a virus to peas with the use of aphids from virus-infected red clover plants growing in the vicinity of the experimental plot; however, it was demonstrated that vetch grown as hay may be a source of pea mosaic with the common pea aphid as a vector. Further experiments in the glasshouse with the use of parasitic fungi causing leaf spots, mildew, wilt, and damping-off of peas were tested for virus transmission with negative results. It was shown, however, that pea nodule bacteria may possibly act as overwintering hosts.

Field tests with 488 strains and varieties of peas over a three-year period showed that no variety was immune to pea mosaic but that two showed a constant degree of resistance; seven varieties, though susceptible, showed no severe or ill effects when contrasted with the check and other susceptible varieties. Eight varieties matured early enough to escape the most severe damage from aphids and mosaic. Streak was not of any great concern in the varietal plantings but did occur destructively in some commercial fields in the Puyallup Valley. It was also found that the variety Potlatch showed a certain degree of resistance or tolerance to pea aphids. A limited test in the glasshouse, with varieties selected in the experimental plot in 1935 and 1936 as showing some degree of resistance to mosaic, substantiated the results obtained in the field.

So far there are no known methods of complete control, which hinges upon three possibilities: (1) the eradication of aphids in the early spring, (2) destruction of leguminous plants susceptible to pea viroses; and (3) the selection of resistant varieties, which is probably of greatest value.

STUDIES ON THE CONTROL OF BLUE-MOLD DECAY OF APPLES¹

RICHARD WELLMAN

Part I. Studies on the chemical control of blue-mold decay of apples

The present investigation was conducted in an attempt to find some chemical treatment that would be better adapted to present commercial practice than the sodium hypochlorite rinse.

The toxicity of sixty-eight different chemicals in aqueous solutions to spores of *Penicillium expansum* Link. was examined. Other investigators had shown many of these chemicals to be fungicidal to other organisms, but only thirteen killed spores of *P. expansum* in one-minute exposures at the concentrations used. These twelve with their effective concentrations were: sodium salicylate, thymol, chromium trioxide, potassium dichromate, and sodium thiosulfate at 10,000 ppm; sodium orthophenylphenate at 5000 ppm; Dovicide P (a mixture of sodium tetrachlorophenate and sodium 2-chlor-orthophenylphenate) at 2500 ppm; and crystal violet, gentian violet, malachite green, iodine, mercuric chloride, and potassium mercuric iodide at 1000 ppm.

Because 1 per cent HCl is used in apple-washing to remove lead arsenate residue, the possibility of incorporating a fungicide with it was investigated. The following compounds were more effective in 1 per cent HCl than in aqueous solutions: chloramine-T, iodine, sodium thiosulfate, and thymol. The fungicidal action of potassium dichromate was decreased in 1 per cent HCl, but the chemical was effective at a concentration of 1-400.

A concentration of 0.4 per cent potassium dichromate in 1 per cent HCl greatly reduced blue-mold decay on Jonathan apples when they were immersed in the solution for 45 seconds at 110° F and held in cold storage at 31° F ($\pm 1^\circ$). In commercial practice these conditions might be obtained in the acid tank of the washing machine. This treatment was less effective in reducing decay when the apples were held in common storage at 46-56° F. after treating than when they were held in cold storage at 31° F. ($\pm 1^\circ$).

¹ Abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Plant Pathology, State College of Washington (1939). The material of the dissertation has been published in part as.

Richard H. Wellman and F. D. Heald. Steam sterilization of apple boxes for blue mold. Wash. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 357 1-16. 1938.

Of fourteen chemicals incorporated in Brogdex wax, seven prevented the development of colonies of *P. expansum* in laboratory experiments. When these seven chemicals were tested on apples, only thymol was found to reduce markedly the amount of decay at a concentration of 0.2 per cent.

Iodized wraps, prepared by soaking wraps in a 1-1000 solution of iodine, reduced but did not prevent decay in a small-scale experiment with Winesap apples.

Part II. The use of streaming steam for the destruction of blue-mold spores on apple boxes.—Because picking boxes are used for several seasons, it is important that they be sterilized each year to destroy *P. expansum* spores. Experiments have shown that a two-minute exposure to streaming steam is sufficient for this purpose.

Part III. The effect of certain factors on amount of blue-mold decay.—Certain experiments were conducted to determine to what extent various washes used in the removal of lead arsenate residue from apples affected the incidence of blue-mold decay and, because Brogdexing is being introduced into commercial apple-handling, its effect on the process of decay control was tested. Punctured fruit exposed to a dual wash, consisting of sodium meta-silicate (80 pounds to 100 gallons of water) followed by 1 per cent HCl developed a much greater percentage of rot than did fruit run over either the single acid wash or the single silicate wash. Brogdexing has no evident effect on the amount of blue-mold decay, but it does interfere with the fungicidal action of sodium hypochlorite. This study also showed that Delicious, Rome, and Winesap apples were decreasingly susceptible to blue-mold decay in the order named.

NEW OR OTHERWISE NOTEWORTHY NORTHWESTERN PLANTS—III¹

CARL W. SHARSMITH

Instructor in Botany

This series of papers was begun at the herbarium of the State College of Washington in 1935 by Constance² in continuation of the earlier, similar series of both Piper and St. John.

Six hitherto unrecorded species, five of which occur in the area covered by St. John³, are listed below, and additional data are given for two previously known species. The first three species are additions to the weed flora of Washington. All specimens cited are in the herbarium of the State College of Washington.

1. *Lepidium latifolium* L. Yakima County, Washington: August, 1932, D. L. Saunders, determination verified by C. Leo Hitchcock, 1939; seven miles west of Wapato, on roadside, July 28, 1938, W. A. Harvey. These appear to represent the first collections of this European species in the western United States, although Hitchcock⁴ cites a puzzling collection from California which may be referable to *Lepidium latifolium*. This species, according to Hitchcock, is introduced in New England and Mexico. In the two Washington collections cited above, it was found on cultivated or disturbed land

2. *Chondrilla juncea* L. Greenacres, Spokane Valley, Spokane County, Washington, October, 1938, J. K. Mahn, transmitted by W. J. Greene, County Agricultural Agent. This species recently appeared as an introduced weed on the farm of J. K. Mahn. It is a native of Europe which is well established in the eastern United States, but is apparently rare or previously unknown in the Northwest.

3. *Carduus nutans* L., Washington: South Pass Road, Sumas, Whatcom County, July 3, 1937, W. C. Muenscher 8493; vicinity of Colfax, Whitman County, June 24, 1939, R. P. Benson. The existence of this species in the weed flora of Whatcom County was recently called to the attention of the writer by W. C. Muenscher. Since then it was collected also in Whitman County.

4. *Castalia odorata* (Dryand. ex Ait.) Woodv. and Wood (*Nymphaea odorata* Dryand.). Newman Lake, Spokane County, Washington,

¹ Contribution No. 62 from the Department of Botany of the State College of Washington.

² Lincoln Constance and Louis A. Dillon, in *Madroño*, III (1935), 170-73; Lincoln Constance and Reed C. Rollins, in *Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.*, XLIX (1936), 147-50.

³ Harold St. John, *Flora of Southeastern Washington and Adjacent Idaho* (Pullman, Wash. Students Book Corporation, 1937)

⁴ C. L. Hitchcock, "The Genus *Lepidium*," *Madroño*, III (1936), 271

August 15, 1938, *Roy D. Shenefelt 139*. The occurrence of this species at this station may indicate a recent introduction or garden escape rather than a hitherto unnoted part of the native flora. If further collections should indicate that the species is indigenous, it will be the second member of the genus found to inhabit the northwestern United States, the other being *Castalia tetragona* (Georgi) Lawson (*Nymphaea tetragona* Georgi, *N. Leibergii* Morong.), which is known from northern Idaho (Granite Station, Bonner County, Idaho, J. B. Leiberg, July, 1892).

5. *Hackelia cinerea* (Piper) Johnston. Spokane County, Washington: Deep Creek Canyon, June 24, 1923, *T. Large 41*; Little Spokane River at mouth of Deep Creek, 12 miles northwest of Spokane, June 12, 1937, *L. Constance 1899*. Determinations verified by I. M. Johnston. This is an extension of known range for *Hackelia cinerea* from Utah, Montana, and Idaho into eastern Washington.

6. *Gutierrezia Sarothrae* (Pursh) Britton and Rusby Common on dry basaltic slopes of the Snake River, four miles north of Rogersburg, Asotin County, Washington, September 7, 1936, *L. Constance 1813*. This record extends the known range of this common western species into Washington

7. *Saxifraga debilis* Engelm. Oregon: wet alpine cliffs, Strawberry Mountains [Grant County], June 24, 1910, *W. C. Cusick 3475*; Eagle Cap Peak, Wallowa Mountains, Wallowa County, September 24, 1938, *C. W. Sharsmith 3970*. Determinations verified by R. Bacigalupi. These are the first two collections of this species in Oregon. Its rarity or absence is, however, only apparent, and it belongs, by the nature of its size and habitat, in the category of "overlooked" species. It should be found occasionally on moist ground under shelving rocks at alpine situations through much of the Pacific States.

8. *Gilia congesta* Hook. Washington: near mouth of Little Spokane River, Spokane County, May 5, 1934, *M. Milburge 874*; open sandy bank of Spokane River near mouth of Little Spokane, May 21, 1937, *L. Constance 1836*. These collections were called to the attention of the writer by L. Constance. They were not included in the treatment of *Gilia congesta* and its allies by Constance and Rollins⁵. They verify the occurrence of this species on the Columbia River drainage where Douglas was considered to have collected the type. Constance annotated the two recent collections from the Spokane River region (a part of the upper Columbia River basin) as topotypes.

⁵ Lincoln Constance and Reed C. Rollins, "A Revision of *Gilia congesta* and Its Allies," *American Journal of Botany*, XXIII (1936), 433-40.

December, 1939

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON



BIRDS OF THE UPPER PENINSULA OF MICHIGAN: <i>Leonard Wing</i>	163
STUDIES OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF SOME FEATURES OF WHEAT GLUMES TO RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING AND OF THE USE OF GLUME STRENGTH AS A TOOL IN SELECTING FOR HIGH RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING: <i>Orville A. Vogel</i>	199
THE STAGE POPULARITY OF <i>The Rehearsal</i> , 1671-1777: <i>Emmett L. Avery</i>	201

Pullman, Washington

RESEARCH STUDIES

of the

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

PAUL P. KIES, *Professor of English*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CARL M. BREWSTER,
Professor of Organic Chemistry

CARL I. ERICKSON,
Associate Professor of Psychology

HERMAN J. DEUTSCH,
Associate Professor of History

RONALD F. MACLENNAN,
Associate Professor of Zoology

Entered as second-class matter December 26, 1936, at the post office at Pullman, Washington, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Research Studies of the State College of Washington is published in Pullman, Washington, by the State College of Washington. It is issued four times a year—in March, June, September, and December.

PURPOSE. *Research Studies* is established to provide a medium of publication for articles of research in the pure sciences and arts; it is limited to material making a contribution to knowledge. Its pages are open to the faculty and the advanced students of the State College of Washington.

MANUSCRIPTS. Authors who wish to publish in *Research Studies* should submit their manuscripts to Paul P. Kies, Room 305, College Hall, Pullman, Washington. Though no strict limit is set as to the maximum number of pages or the nature or number of illustrations, authors are reminded that the papers must be actual research. Long introductions, unnecessary comments, and repetitions are not acceptable. Authors who will assume the expense may arrange for the inclusion of extra pages, tables, or illustrations.

EXCHANGE. *Research Studies* is offered in exchange to other colleges, universities, learned societies, and libraries. Publications sent in return should be addressed to the Exchange Department, Library, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. Individuals may subscribe to *Research Studies*. The journal will be mailed postpaid to subscribers for two dollars a year. Subscriptions are payable in advance to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A. As long as available, single issues will be sold at the prices listed on the page following the "Contents of Volume VII" and on pages 119-20 of Volume VII; at present all back numbers and title pages are still in stock. They may be ordered from the same address. The price of the present number is fifty cents.

RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

VOLUME VII

December, 1939

NUMBER 4

BIRDS OF THE UPPER PENINSULA OF MICHIGAN¹

LEONARD WING

Assistant Professor of Game Management

Two great peninsulas form the state of Michigan. The Upper Peninsula lies north of the Lower Peninsula and covers more than 16,000 square miles. The Upper Peninsula stretches east and west some 330 miles, and its north and south stretch is over 165 miles. It is thus an area of considerable size.

The field work upon which this work is based was supported chiefly by Mr. William G. Fargo, Jackson, Michigan, whose unfailing interest has been responsible for much of the recent renaissance in Michigan ornithological circles, and to whom grateful acknowledgement is made for his assistance.

The observations reported in this paper have resulted from five separate trips to the Upper Peninsula totaling eighty-two days of field work. These trips were: August 16-19, 1923; June 4-12, 1931; August 21-29, 1931 (accompanied by Mr. George Wing); January 16-February 3, 1932; June 20-July 30, 1932 (accompanied by Mr. Norman A. Wood). Though the field work of necessity has been scattered over a large area, several stops of various lengths were made at several localities. Side trips were also made from these stopping points. It seems desirable to describe the conditions of these areas as they existed in 1932 and previously. The dates in parentheses refer to dates of visits.

St. Ignace (August 16-19, 1923; June 4, 13, August 21, 29, 1931; January 16, June 20, July 30, 1932). The immediate shore about St.

¹The manuscript was completed March 1, 1933. Only a few minor changes have been incorporated since. I acknowledge my thanks to the Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, and to its faculty both for the cooperation received while I was a member of the Museum staff and for the many courtesies which have been extended to me since. I am especially indebted to Mr. Norman A. Wood, Mr. Frederick M. Gaige, Mr. Thomas Hinshaw, and Dr. Josselyn Van Tyne, of the Museum, for much help and many kindnesses.

Ignace is thickly dotted with cottages. The land along the two or three main highways is cultivated, but elsewhere cut-over lands predominate.

Munuskong Bay (June 21-23, 1932). The Munuskong State Park occupies the shore of the Bay along St. Mary's River. The higher ground surrounding the Bay is covered with a heavy second-growth predominantly maple (*Acer saccharum*). The water was low, and great mud flats were exposed at the time of our visit.

Lake Superior State Forest (June 24-July 3, 1932). The State Forest occupies the entire northern part of Luce County. It lies between Lake Superior and the first township line south of the lake (line between T48N and T49N). A low water-washed moraine extends east and west across the county along the southern border of the forest. A flat level plain lies between the moraine and the lake. The soil is chiefly a thin sand. Having once been the floor of glacial Lake Algonquin, it shows the effects of water action.

The original timber of the forest, which consisted chiefly of white pine (*Pinus strobus*), was logged off forty years or more before our visit. Since the establishment of the State Forest, reforestation has progressed rapidly. Fires have been controlled, fire lines have been built, and many areas without seed trees have been replanted. In some places the reproduction is thin, but in others quite thick and from twenty to thirty feet high. A few hundred acres of virgin Jack Pine (*Pinus banksiana*) remain along the Two-hearted River in the northeastern part of the county. Contrary to popular belief, the Jack Pine makes a sizable tree under virgin conditions. It may stand more than a hundred feet in height and have a trunk diameter exceeding eighteen inches. No undergrowth exists under the virgin pines. A narrow belt of virgin timber extends across the county along the southern border of the State Forest.

McMillan (June 10, 1931; January 17-20, July 4, 1932). Cleared land exists as narrow belts along the few highways. The remaining land is principally cedar and spruce swamps, and second-growth hardwoods. A few white pines and groves of hemlocks are also to be found. The crop of birch seeds was reported as much lighter in 1931 than in the previous year.

Blaney (July 29-30, 1932). The area about Blaney is similar to the uncleared lands about McMillan.

Rapid River (June 5-9, 1931). Cut-over lands and second-growth hardwoods characterize the Rapid River country. Jack pines grow on the poorer sites, hardwoods on the better sites, and spruce and cedar in the swamps. Open grass, willows, and tag alders grow along many of the stream bottoms.

Southern Marquette County (June 10-12, 1931; July 4-5, 1932). The southern part of the county is a mixture of cleared lands, cut-over lands, and virgin timber. The timber is mostly hemlock-hardwoods with a few scattered pines.

Sturgeon River Valley^{*} (July 6-9, 1932). This valley is an ancient south-flowing glacial channel. The valley is from one- to three-hundred feet deep. The present Sturgeon River flows northward over the valley floor and has cut a deeper channel of its own in the bottom of the valley. Pools left by shifts in the channel attract Song Sparrows and Chimney Swifts, the latter skimming along the surface of the water. The rim of the valley and the surrounding plain are covered with jack pines, and the bottom and the sides of the valley are covered with maple, birch, and white pine reproduction.

Ironwood (August 25-26, 1931; January 21-30, July 9-28, 1932). Ironwood is a mining city situated in a farming district which extends northward about five miles. Scattered clearings reach almost to Lake Superior. Economic distress of the past few years makes it probable that considerable additional area will be cleared for farms, which in general will be marginal. A continuous belt of farm land lies between Ironwood and Bessemer, six miles to the east. The roughness of the terrain north of Bessemer restricts the cleared areas to the few scattered around the town itself.

The major part of the time at Ironwood was spent in the Black-River Highlands, east of the Black River and four miles south of Lake Superior. The Highlands occupy portions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 9, T48N, R46W; and sections 32, 33, 34, T49N, R46W. They cover an elevated area of some four square miles, composed of rolling elevations and depressions. An extensive peat bog covered with black spruce, birch, and maple bounds the Highlands on the south. They slope northward to the comparatively low level lands near the lake.

^{*} Side trips were made on July 7 and 8 into Baraga County and to Sidaaw, Houghton County.

The soil is composed of a thin layer of glacial drift. The streams have cut through the drift and into the rocks below. Black River itself is filled with glacial boulders.

Watermeet (January 31-February 3, 1932). Watermeet is an old lumber town lying in a region of cut-over lands, burns, and spruce swamps. The soils are generally sandy.

Alpha (August 27-28, 1931). Alpha is on an outwash plain. Many small spruce swamps, aspen-covered burns, and coppices are to be found. There are also many farms in the region.

Population indexes are of great value in serious population studies. My field data for the year 1932 make it possible to construct index tables for the frequency of occurrence and for the relative abundance of the several species observed. The frequency of occurrence is an index figure based upon the ratio of the number of days on which a species has been observed and the total number of days of field observation. Thus, if a species is observed on fifty different days and the total days afield number one hundred, the frequency is .50. Likewise, the relative abundance may be determined from the total number of individuals of a species observed and the number of days of field observation. Three hundred and twenty-five individuals observed during the one hundred days mentioned above would give an abundance of 3.25. Table 1 gives the

TABLE 1

Winter frequency of occurrence based upon fourteen days of observation (1932).

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
1a	Black-capped Chickadee	93	8a	Pileated Woodpecker	14
1b	Downy Woodpecker	93	8b	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	14
2	Hairy Woodpecker	86	8c	Goldfinch	14
3	Ruffed Grouse	57	8d	Pine Siskin	14
4	White-breasted Nuthatch	.50	8e	Pine Grosbeak	.14
5	Red Crossbill	.36	9a	Prairie Chicken	.07
6a	Raven	.29	9b	Blue Jay	.07
6b	Brown Creeper	.29	9c	Evening Grosbeak	.07
7a	Red-breasted Nuthatch	.21	9d	White-winged Crossbill	.07
7b	Golden-crowned Kinglet	.21	9e	Redpoll	.07
7c	Snow Bunting	.21			

winter frequency based upon fourteen observation days during January and February, 1932, the twenty-one species being ranked in descending order of frequency. A frequency of 1.00 would mean a species observed on all observation days. Table 2 gives the winter relative abundance based upon the same observation days, the sixteen species for which good data are available being ranked in descending order of relative abundance.

TABLE 2

Winter relative abundance based upon fourteen days of observation (1932).

Rank	Species	Relative abundance	Rank	Species	Relative abundance
1	Black-capped Chickadee	12.18 ^a	9	Snow Bunting	1.21
2	Hairy Woodpecker	5.54 ^a	10a	White-breasted Nuthatch	1.00
3	Red Crossbill	5.14	10b	Golden-crowned Kinglet	1.00
4	Red-breasted Nuthatch	3.29	11	Brown Creeper	.57
5	Downy Woodpecker	2.93	12	Pileated Woodpecker	.21
6	Goldfinch	1.79	13	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	.14
7	Ruffed Grouse	1.71	14	Blue Jay	.07
8a	Prairie Chicken	1.43			
8b	Pine Grosbeak	1.43			

Similar index tables for the frequency of occurrence and the relative abundance of species observed on forty-one days in the summer of 1932 are given in Tables 3 and 4. In order to have the tables uniform, I have presented data from my own field observations only. As in Tables 1 and 2, species are ranked in descending order of frequency and abundance.

A study of the data available for the Black-River Highlands of Gogebic County shows that six days of observation there in January, 1932, covered the same routes as nine days of observation in the following July. The observations were made in hemlock-hardwood slashings and in virgin timber. Table 5 gives the frequency of occurrence for eleven species observed in the winter, and Table 6 the frequency of occurrence for fifty-four species observed in the summer, both sets of observations having been made over the area described. Similar data for the winter and summer relative abundances are given in Tables 7 and 8.

^a Based upon eleven days of observation.

^a Based upon thirteen days of observation.

TABLE 3

Summer frequency of occurrence based upon forty-one field-observation days (1932).

Rank	Species	Frequency	Rank	Species	Frequency
1	Song Sparrow	.85	19f	Myrtle Warbler	.24
2	Robin	.83	19g	Mourning Warbler	.24
3	Chimney Swift	.78	19h	Indigo Bunting	.24
4	Hermit Thrush	.71	20a	American Bittern	.20
5a	Flicker	.68	20b	Spotted Sandpiper	.20
5b	Kingbird	.68	20c	Alder Flycatcher	.20
5c	Ovenbird	.68	20d	Chestnut-sided Warbler	.20
5d	White-throated Sparrow	.68	20e	Northern Yellow-throat	.20
6	Bluebird	.63	21a	Short-billed Marsh Wren	.17
7	Chickadee	.61	21b	Black-throated Blue Warbler	.17
8a	Vesper Sparrow	.54	21c	Red-winged Blackbird	.17
8b	Chipping Sparrow	.54	21d	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	.17
9	Crow	.51	22a	Prairie Horned Lark	.15
10a	Least Flycatcher	.49	22b	Bobolink	.15
10b	Purple Finch	.49	22c	Scarlet Tanager	.15
11a	Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	.46	23a	Spruce Grouse	.12
11b	Goldfinch	.46	23b	Herring Gull	.12
12	Red-eyed Vireo	.44	23c	Olive-sided Flycatcher	.12
13	Slate-colored Junco	.42	23d	Raven	.12
14a	Great Blue Heron	.39	23e	White-breasted Nuthatch	.12
14b	Hairy Woodpecker	.39	23f	Red-breasted Nuthatch	.12
15a	House Wren	.37	23g	Black and White Warbler	.12
15b	Black-throated Green Warbler	.37	23h	Starling	.12
15c	Savannah Sparrow	.37	24a	Marsh Hawk	.10
15d	Swamp Sparrow	.37	24b	Black Tern	.10
16	Sparrow Hawk	.34	24c	Migrant Shrike	.10
17a	Phoebe	.32	24d	Blue-headed Vireo	.10
17b	Wood Pewee	.32	24e	Wilson's Thrush	.10
17c	Winter Wren	.32	24f	Red Crossbill	.10
17d	Eastern Meadowlark	.32	24g	Pine Siskin	.10
18a	Ruffed Grouse	.29	25a	Whip-poor-will	.07
18b	Nighthawk	.29	25b	Bank Swallow	.07
18c	Downy Woodpecker	.29	25c	Barn Swallow	.07
18d	Bronzed Grackle	.29	25d	Golden-crowned Kinglet	.07
18e	Cowbird	.29	25e	Water-thrush	.07
18f	Evening Grosbeak	.29	26a	Mallard Duck	.05
19a	Killdeer	.24	26b	Black Duck	.05
19b	Tree Swallow	.24	26c	Blue-winged Teal	.05
19c	Blue Jay	.24	26d	Red-tailed Hawk	.05
19d	Brown Creeper	.24	26e	Wilson's Snipe	.05
19e	Nashville Warbler	.24	26f	Upland Plover	.05

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Rank	Species	Frequency	Rank	Species	Frequency
26g	Red-headed Woodpecker	.05	27i	Yellow-bellied Flycatcher	.02
26h	Canada Warbler	.05	27j	Crested Flycatcher	.02
26i	Redstart	.05	27k	Cliff Swallow	.02
27a	Loon	.02	27l	Hudsonian Chickadee	.02
27b	Osprey	.02	27m	Olive-sided Flycatcher	.02
27c	Sharp-shinned Hawk	.02	27n	Blackburnian Warbler	.02
27d	Coot	.02	27o	Brewer's Blackbird	.02
27e	Common Tern	.02	27p	Western Meadowlark	.02
27f	Sharp-tailed Grouse	.02	27q	Red-eyed Towhee	.02
27g	Pileated Woodpecker	.02	27r	White-winged Crossbill	.02
27h	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	.02	27s	Clay-colored Sparrow	.02

TABLE 4

Summer relative abundance based upon forty-one field-observation days.
(1932)

Rank	Species	Relative abundance	Rank	Species	Relative abundance
1	Song Sparrow	8.29	21	Swamp Sparrow	1.17
2	White-throated Sparrow	7.22	22	Goldfinch	1.15
3	Robin	4.80	23	Red-eyed Vireo	1.12
4	Evening Grosbeak	4.51	24a	Herring Gull	1.07
5	Chipping Sparrow	2.85	24b	House Wren	1.07
6	Black-capped Chickadee	2.39	25	Red-winged Blackbird	.98
7	Chimney Swift	2.37	26a	Great Blue Heron	.95
8	Purple Finch	2.32	26b	Hairy Woodpecker	.95
9a	Ruffed Grouse	2.20	27	Black Tern	.93
9b	Slate-colored Junco	2.20	28a	Brown Creeper	.89
10	Ovenbird	2.07	28b	Cowbird	.89
11a	Kingbird	2.02	29	Starling	.85
11b	Hermit Thrush	2.02	30	Myrtle Warbler	.83
12	Least Flycatcher	1.89	31	Downy Woodpecker	.78
13	Crow	1.85	32a	Sparrow Hawk	.73
14	Savannah Sparrow	1.78	32b	Phoebe	.73
15a	Tree Sparrow	1.61	32c	Winter Wren	.73
15b	Eastern Meadowlark	1.61	33a	Nighthawk	.66
16	Vesper Sparrow	1.49	33b	Pine Siskin	.66
17	Flicker	1.46	34a	Cliff Swallow	.61
18a	Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	1.39	34b	Bronzed Grackle	.61
18b	Black-throated Green Warbler	1.39	35a	Nashville Warbler	.56
19	Short-billed Marsh Wren	1.37	35b	Mourning Warbler	.56
20	Bluebird	1.29	36	Wood Pewee	.51
			37	Killdeer	.49

TABLE 4 (Continued)

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Relative abundance</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Relative abundance</i>
38	Indigo Bunting	.42	47b	Canada Warbler	.15
39a	Black Duck	.39	48a	Blue-winged Teal	.12
39b	Raven	.39	48b	Wilson's Snipe	.12
39c	Blue Jay	.39	48c	Red-headed Woodpecker	.12
40a	Chestnut-sided Warbler	.37	48d	Wilson's Thrush	.12
40b	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	.37	48e	Magnolia Warbler	.12
40c	Red Crossbill	.37	49a	Coot	.10
41a	American Bittern	.34	49b	Blue-headed Vireo	.10
41b	Alder Flycatcher	.34	49c	Redstart	.10
42a	Spotted Sandpiper	.29	49d	Red-eyed Towhee	.10
42b	Northern Yellow-throat	.29	50a	Osprey	.07
42c	Bobolink	.29	50b	Western Meadowlark	.07
43a	Marsh Hawk	.27	51a	Red-tailed Hawk	.05
43b	Black-throated Blue Warbler	.27	51b	Upland Plover	.05
44a	Spruce Grouse	.22	51c	Common Tern	.05
44b	Prairie Horned Lark	.22	51d	Hudsonian Chickadee	.05
44c	White-breasted Nuthatch	.22	51e	Blackburnian Warbler	.05
45a	Mallard Duck	.20	51f	White-winged Crossbill	.05
45b	Golden-crowned Kinglet	.20	52a	Loon	.02
45c	Migrant Shrike	.20	52b	Sharp-shinned Hawk	.02
45d	Black and White Warbler	.20	52c	Sharp-tailed Grouse	.02
46a	Olive-sided Flycatcher	.17	52d	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	.02
46b	Barn Swallow	.17	52e	Pileated Woodpecker	.02
46c	Bank Swallow	.17	52f	Crested Flycatcher	.02
46d	Water-thrush	.17	52g	Yellow-bellied Flycatcher	.02
46e	Scarlet Tanager	.17	52h	Olive-backed Thrush	.02
47a	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	.15	52i	Brewer's Blackbird	.02

TABLE 5

Winter frequency of occurrence in the Black-River Highlands, based upon six field-observation days (1932).

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
1a	Hairy Woodpecker	100	4a	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	33
1b	Black-capped Chickadee	100	4b	Pileated Woodpecker	33
2	Downy Woodpecker	83	4c	Golden-crowned Kinglet	33
3a	Ruffed Grouse	50	5a	Brown Creeper	17
3b	White-breasted Nuthatch	50	5b	Red Crossbill	.17
3c	Raven	50			

TABLE 6

Summer frequency of occurrence in the Black-River Highlands, based upon nine field-observation days (1932).

Rank	Species	Frequency	Rank	Species	Frequency
1a	Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	1.00	6d	Slate-colored Junco	.44
1b	Black-capped Chickadee	1.00	7a	Olive-sided Flycatcher	.33
1c	Robin	1.00	7b	Blue Jay	.33
1d	White-throated Sparrow	1.00	7c	Raven	.33
1e	Song Sparrow	1.00	7d	Red-breasted Nuthatch	.33
2a	Least Flycatcher	.89	7e	Bluebird	.33
2b	Hermit Thrush	.89	7f	Water-thrush	.33
2c	Mourning Warbler	.89	7g	Northern Yellow-throat	.33
2d	Goldfinch	.89	7h	Scarlet Tanager	.33
3a	Chimney Swift	.78	7i	Chipping Sparrow	.33
3b	Hairy Woodpecker	.78	7j	Swamp Sparrow	.33
3c	Winter Wren	.78	8a	Red-tailed Hawk	.22
3d	Red-eyed Vireo	.78	8b	Alder Flycatcher	.22
3e	Ovenbird	.78	8c	Wilson's Thrush	.22
4a	Ruffed Grouse	.67	8d	Golden-crowned Kinglet	.22
4b	Downy Woodpecker	.67	8e	Black-throated Green	
4c	House Wren	.67		Warbler	.22
4d	Black-throated Green		8f	Canada Warbler	.22
	Warbler	.67	8g	Pine Siskin	.22
4e	Chestnut-sided Warbler	.67	9a	Sparrow Hawk	.11
4f	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	.67	9b	Pileated Woodpecker	.11
5a	Flicker	.56	9c	Arctic Three-toed	
5b	Kingbird	.56		Woodpecker	.11
5c	Wood Pewee	.56	9d	Phoebe	.11
5d	Black and White Warbler	.56	9e	Yellow-bellied Flycatcher	.11
5e	Indigo Bunting	.56	9f	Olive-backed Thrush	.11
6a	White-breasted Nuthatch	.44	9g	Redstart	.11
6b	Brown Creeper	.44	9h	Cowbird	.11
6c	Purple Finch	.44			

TABLE 7

Winter relative abundance based upon six field-observation days in the Black-River Highlands (1932).

Rank	Species	Relative abundance	Rank	Species	Relative abundance
1	Hairy Woodpecker	8.40 ^a	6b	White-breasted Nuthatch	.83
2	Black-capped Chickadee	6.40 ^a	7	Pileated Woodpecker	.50
3	Downy Woodpecker	2.00	8	Arctic Three-toed	
4	Golden-crowned Kinglet	1.33		Woodpecker	.33
5	Raven	1.00	9	Brown Creeper	.17
6a	Ruffed Grouse	.83			

^a Based upon five field-observation days.

TABLE 8

Summer relative abundance based upon nine field-observation days in the Black-River Highlands (1932).

Rank	Species	Relative abundance	Rank	Species	Relative abundance
1	White-throated Sparrow	20.22	19b	Wood Pewee	.89
2	Song Sparrow	14.33	19c	White-breasted Nuthatch	.89
3	Black-capped Chickadee	4.89	19d	Black and White Warbler	.89
4	Robin	4.33	20a	Golden-crowned Kinglet	.78
5a	Ruffed Grouse	3.89	20b	Water-thrush	.78
5b	Least Flycatcher	3.89	20c	Chipping Sparrow	.78
6	Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	3.22	21a	Blue Jay	.67
7a	Hairy Woodpecker	2.33	21b	Canada Warbler	.67
7b	House Wren	2.33	22	Olive-sided Flycatcher	.56
8	Hermit Thrush	2.22	23a	Red-breasted Nuthatch	.44
9a	Winter Wren	2.11	23b	Scarlet Tanager	.44
9b	Mourning Warbler	2.11	23c	Swamp Sparrow	.44
10	Downy Woodpecker	2.00	24a	Bluebird	.33
11a	Brown Creeper	1.89	24b	Northern Yellow-throat	.33
11b	Ovenbird	1.89	24c	Redstart	.33
11c	Purple Finch	1.89	25a	Red-tailed Hawk	.22
12a	Red-eyed Vireo	1.78	25b	Alder Flycatcher	.22
12c	Goldfinch	1.78	25c	Wilson's Thrush	.22
13	Pine Siskin	1.67	25d	Black-throated Green Warbler	.22
14	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	1.56	25e	Cowbird	.22
15	Slate-colored Junco	1.33	26a	Sparrow Hawk	.11
16a	Kingbird	1.22	26b	Pileated Woodpecker	.11
16b	Chestnut-sided Warbler	1.22	26c	Arctic Three-toed Woodpecker	.11
17a	Black-throated Blue Warbler	1.11	26d	Phoebe	.11
17b	Indigo Bunting	1.11	26e	Yellow-bellied Flycatcher	.11
18a	Chimney Swift	1.00	26f	Olive-backed Thrush	.11
18b	Raven	1.00			
19a	Flicker	.89			

The following annotated list of 131 species gives the dates and places where I have observed them in the Upper Peninsula. Sub-specific names are used only when specimens have been critically examined. No subspecies has been included on the basis of probability.

The indexes of frequency of occurrence and relative abundance for all localities of the summer and winter of 1932 are given and are identified by the symbols SF, SA, WF, and WA, respectively (see

also tables 1-4). The summer indexes, as has been stated previously, are based upon forty-one field-observation days, and the winter indexes are based upon fourteen field-observation days.

LESSER LOON, *Gavia immer elasson* Bishop. (SF .02, SA .02). A study of the Michigan specimens of *Gavia immer* in the collections of the Museum of Zoology shows that nearly all, if not all, of the birds of both peninsulas of the state are referable to *elasson*. There is some question about the very few relatively large specimens; that they may prove to be *Gavia i immer* appears not at all impossible. It is thought best not to refer them definitely to *immer* for the present.

Mr. Wood and I observed a Loon on a small lake south of Sidnaw, July 6, 1932. The local conservation warden informed us that the lake contained no game fish, though many attempts had been made to stock it.

DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANT, *Phalacrocorax auritus* (Linn.). A Double-crested Cormorant flew from the water ahead of the ferry on which I crossed the Straits of Mackinac, June 13, 1931. This species may be nesting among the rocks along the north shore, perhaps near Brevort, fifteen miles west of the ferry crossing.

GREAT BLUE HERON, *Ardea herodias herodias* Linn. (SF .39, SA .95).

1931 · Rapid River, July 6.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4; Sturgeon River, July 6.

AMERICAN BITTERN, *Botaurus lentiginosus* (Montagu) (SF .20, SA .34).

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-27, July 4; Sturgeon River, July 6.

MALLARD DUCK, *Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos* Linn. (SF .05, SA .20).

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21; Ironwood, July 20.

BLACK DUCK, *Anas rupripes* subspecies. (SF .05, SA .39).

1932 · Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 30.

BLUE-WINGED TEAL, *Nettion carolinense* (Gmelin). (SF .05, SA .12).

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 26.

LESSER SCAUP DUCK, *Nyroca affinis* (Eyton). I saw three males and two females near the ferry dock at Mackinaw City, June 4, 1931,

and three males and two females there again June 12. Numerous small pit-lakes lie in shallow depressions of the outwash plain near the village of Gwinn, Marquette County; most of these lakes are in the process of extinction and are ringed with *Chaemedaphne*-covered peat. I found two groups of lesser Scaups in such a lake west of Gwinn, June 8, 1931. Each group consisted of one male and three females. June 10, 1931, I observed a lone male feeding in a beaver pond in Baraga County, twenty miles southeast of L'Anse. It may have been the male of a nesting pair.

SHARP-SHINNED HAWK, *Accipiter velox velox* (Wilson). (SF .02, SA .02).

1932: McFarland (also called Turin), Marquette County, July 5.

RED-TAILED HAWK, *Buteo borealis borealis* (Gmelin). (SF .05, SA .05).

1932: Ironwood, July 23, July 25.

BROAD-WINGED HAWK, *Buteo platypterus platypterus* (Viellot).

1931: Kenton, Houghton County, August 24; Montreal River, Gogebic County, August 25.

BALD EAGLE, *Haliaetus leucocephalus leucocephalus* (Linn.).

1931: Montreal River, Gogebic County, August 25

MARSH HAWK, *Circus hudsonius* (Linn.). (SF .10, SA .27).

1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, July 2, McFarland, July 5; Sidnaw, July 6; Sturgeon River, July 7.

OSPREY, *Pandion haliaetus carolinensis* (Gmelin). (SF .10, SA .27).

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21

SPARROW HAWK, *Falco sparverius sparverius* Linn. (SF 34, SA .71).

1923: Trout Lake, August 17.

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Kenton, August 24-25; Ironwood, August 26.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 8; Sidnaw, July 9; Ironwood, July 11.

This species is quite common in the burned-over lands, and in the jack pine areas where standing stubs are numerous.

SPRUCE GROUSE, *Canachites canadensis canacae* (Linn.). (SF 12, SA .22).

Mr. Wood and I saw a Spruce Grouse near the south boundary of the Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 1932. It flushed from the edge of a spruce swamp and disappeared in the mixed jack pine and hardwood growth of the higher ground. We saw the species again on June 30, July 1, 3, and 4. We found a female with downy young on July 3, 1932. Spruce Grouse frequent the swamps but are found oftener in the jack pine areas which cover the major portion of the higher land of the region. This seems especially true of birds with young. A female was taken July 3 with two young.

CANADA RUFFED GROUSE, *Bonasa umbellus togata* (Linn.). (SF .29, SA 2.20, WF .57, WA 1.71).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Kenton, August 21-22; Ironwood, August 25.

1932: McMillan, January 18-19; Ironwood, January 21-22, 24-25; Watersmeet, January 31, February 2; St. Ignace, June 20; McFarland, July 6; Ironwood, July 11-13, 16, 19, 20-22, 27.

The Ruffed Grouse breeds throughout the Upper Peninsula, being in greatest abundance in the slashings and swamps. In 1931 and 1932, the Grouse were commoner in the western than in the eastern end of the peninsula, perhaps because of the difference in timber conditions of the west and east.

I collected a specimen at McMillan on January 18, 1932, that had lost a tarsus and foot. The grouse was "budding" in a maple tree and seemed not to be impaired in its movements.

Though the tail feathers of the young grouse which were collected were predominantly rufous, those of most of the adults were gray. In some specimens of immature birds, both red and gray feathers existed in the tails. Whereas the red feathers were usually unmolted old ones, the gray feathers were new ones. In some areas, such as the Black-River Highlands, the presence of rufous feathers in the adult birds seemed much more pronounced than in other areas. It would appear that the rufous character is the more recent, and the relationship between rufous and gray more complicated than commonly supposed.

GREATER PRAIRIE CHICKEN, *Tympanuchus cupido americanus* (Reich.). (SF .02, SA .02, WF .07, WA 1.43).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-9, ("booming"); Sidnaw, June 10.

1932: Blaney, July 30; Watersmeet, February 2.

The flock found near Watersmeet contained twenty birds. They were in a spruce and birch swamp at the edge of the town.

PRAIRIE SHARP-TAILED GROUSE, *Pediocetes phasianellus campestris* Ridgway. Sharp-tailed Grouse seem to occur in considerable numbers in the western end of the peninsula. Mr. Wood and I saw one near Beaver Lake, Alger County, July 4, 1932. Near Nestoria, Baraga County, I found an immature female on August 21, 1931, that had been killed by an automobile. Mr. Wood and I found another young Sharp-tail likewise killed by an automobile, in Houghton County, some three miles west of Sidnaw, July 9, 1932.

AMERICAN COOT, *Fulica americana americana* Gmelin. (SF .02, SA .10).

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 21 (four miles south of Deer Park).

KILLDEER, *Oxyechus vociferus vociferus* (Linn.). (SF .24, SA .49). 1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 21, 23, 27-30, July 4; Kenton, July 9; Ironwood, July 15, 27.

AMERICAN WOODCOCK, *Philohela minor* (Gmelin). 1931: Schoolcraft County, June 12.

WILSON'S SNIFE, *Capella delicata* (Ord). (SF .05, SA 12). 1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22.

UPLAND PLOVER, *Bartramia longicauda* (Bech.). (SF .05, SA .05). 1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: Ironwood, July 26; Rexton, July 30.

SPOTTED SANDPIPER, *Actitis macularia* (Linn.). (SF .20, SA .32). 1931: Rapid River, June 6; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26. 1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-25; Sturgeon River, July 7-9.

HERRING GULL, *Larus argentatus smithsonianus* Coues. (SF .12, SA 1.07).

1931: Rapid River, June 6, Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22, 24; Lake Superior State Forest, June 24, July 4.

COMMON TERN, *Sterna hirundo hirundo* Linn. (SF .02, SA .05). 1932: St. Ignace, June 20.

BLACK TERN, *Chlidonias nigra surinamensis* (Gmelin). (SF .10, SA .93).

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, July 1.

MOURNING DOVE, *Zenaidura macroura carolinensis* (Linn.). The Mourning Dove is not common anywhere in the Upper Peninsula, and I have rarely seen it in the timberlands where I have spent most of my field time.

BLACK-BILLED CUCKOO, *Cuculus erythrophthalmus* (Wilson). One specimen was collected at Walsh, Schoolcraft County, June 12, 1931.

GREAT HORNED OWL, *Bubo virginianus* (Gmelin). This species was heard several times at night between July 10 and July 27 at Ironwood.

EASTERN WHIP-POOR-WILL, *Antrostomus vociferus vociferus* (Wilson). (SF .07). Whip-poor-wills were common about the sand ridges northeast of Rapid River, June 5-9, 1931. Eight or ten could be heard at one time. I watched a courtship performance that took place at dusk in a small opening. The bird I took to be the female was in the center of the small open spot. The other bird approached uttering a series of hollow noises sounding like "chunk, chunk . . ." When near, the latter opened his wings and stretched them outwards in a graceful arc. He increased the rate of calling, and the female fluttered about closely pursued by the male. A short ground pursuit was followed by the female flying off with the other in close pursuit.

The song as ordinarily heard consists of three notes which can be rendered as "whip-poor-will." At close range, a fourth note is heard, a "chunk" similar to the sound used in the courtship performance described earlier. This note is sandwiched between the "whip" and the "poor" and makes the song become "whip-chunk-poor-will." The added note is not heard at any distance, thus creating the three-note song. To my ear, the added note gives the impression of a sudden intake of breath.

A whip-poor-will was heard at Marenisco, Gogebic County, August 27, 1931. It was heard on the Sturgeon River, July 7-9, 1932.

EASTERN NIGHTHAWK, *Chordeiles minor minor* (Forester). (SF .29, SA .66).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Kenton, August 23.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 24, 26-July 4; Sturgeon River, July 6; Kenton, July 9.

Shortly before dark at Kenton, August 23, 1931, I witnessed two flights of Nighthawks as they passed overhead. I was unable to see more than a score through the opening in the forest canopy, but their calls indicated many more. They flew in loosely drawn-out bands head-

ing due south. The second band was probably five or six miles behind the first, both about five-hundred feet above the tree tops. Individuals circled and swung about as though feeding, without, however, disturbing the general continuity of the flight. The birds uttered the nasal "peank" call. Once I heard the deep "quonk" call but did not see the bird that made it. The day was clear, although rather damp from the rains of the previous day.

CHIMNEY SWIFT, *Chaetura pelagica* (Linn.). (SF .78, SA 2.37).
1931: Kenton, August 22, 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.
1932: Observed at all stations of observation in the summer. The only days on which it was *not* seen were: Ironwood, July 14, 16-17, 24, 26-27.

EASTERN BELTED KINGFISHER, *Megasceryle alcyon* (Linn.).
1931: Rapid River, July 6; Kenton, August 22-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

NORTHERN FLICKER, *Colaptes auratus luteus* Bangs. (SF .68, SA 1.46).

1931: Rapid River, July 6-7.
1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21, Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 2, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 15-16, 19-24, 26-27, 29.

NORTHERN PILEATED WOODPECKER, *Ceophloeus pileatus abieticola* (Bangs). (SF .02, SA .02, WF .14, WA .21).

1931: McFarland, June 10; McMillan, June 12; Kenton, August 23; Marenisco, August 27.

1932: Ironwood, January 21-22, July 19.

RED-HEADED WOODPECKER, *Melanerpes erythrocephalus* (Linn.). (SF .05, SA .12).

1932: Ironwood, July 12, 15.

YELLOW-BELLIED SAPSUCKER, *Sphyrapicus varius varius* (Linn.). (SF .46, SA 1.39).

1931: Kenton, June 6; Marenisco, August 27.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 28; McFarland, July 5; Ironwood, July 11-13, 15-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27.

HAIRY WOODPECKER, *Dryobates villosus villosus* (Linn.). *Dryobates villosus septentrionalis* (Nutt.). (SF. 39, SA .95, WF .86, WA 5.54).

1931: Kenton, August 22-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24.

1932:McMillan, January 19-20; Ironwood, January 21-30, Watersmeet, January 31, February 1-2; Lake Superior State Forest, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Ironwood, July 10, 15-16, 18-25, 27; Blaney, July 29.

The Hairy Woodpeckers well illustrate the difficulties encountered in identifying the birds living in the zone of "intermediation." *D. villosus*, as a species, ranges from Florida to the Yukon. Despite this broad range, the change from the small dark birds of the south to the large light birds of the north is remarkably uniform. No substantial breaks in either measurements or color of the plumage can be noted.

The extremes are easily recognized, but the intermediates are somewhat of a problem. It might be argued that we should consider them all as intermediates. This might be satisfactory if a subspecies were considered only as an instrument of the taxonomist, instead of a factor playing an important role in zoology. It is likely that subspecies are generally incipient species. Thus if the line of subspecific differentiation is located, the line of potential speciation is also located. This line, in reality, is the locus of an evolutionary process, and the discernment of its cause and mechanism will depend upon our own ability to read its sign and interpret the meaning.

The specimens from Ironwood are larger and whiter than the average Michigan specimens. An influx of larger and whiter birds occurs in the winter, not only at Ironwood but elsewhere. The taxonomic evidence is corroborated by the index evidence. The summer frequency of occurrence is .39, as compared with a winter frequency of .86. The summer relative abundance of .95 is but a sixth of the winter abundance of 5.54. The winter frequency in the Black-River Highlands (Ironwood) is 1.00, meaning that the birds were frequent enough to be found on all field days. The summer frequency, on the other hand, is .78 (see Tables 5 and 6). The summer relative abundance in the Black-River Highlands is 2.33, in contrast to the winter relative abundance of 8.40 (see Tables 7 and 8). There is always a greater chance of detecting woodpeckers in the winter because of the greater visibility in the leafless woods and also the greater range of sounds. However, immature birds were in the woods in July and should have balanced this factor to some extent at least. A conservative deduction from these indexes would be that there are two or three times as many wintering Hairy Woodpeckers as summering Hairy Woodpeckers.

In order to test the possibility that the whiter appearance of the plumage might be due to absence of soiling agents, I washed specimens

from the Upper Peninsula and specimens of typical *villosus* (taken in other localities) in a solution of soap chips and water. The differences between the birds persisted after the laundry process.

It is very clear, therefore, that the western end of the Upper Peninsula is occupied by resident Hairy Woodpeckers tending toward the *septentrionalis* type. An invasion of larger and whiter birds occurs in the winter, some of them being definitely referable to *septentrionalis*.

DOWNY WOODPECKER, *Dryobates pubescens medianus* (Swainson) and *Dryobates pubescens nelsoni* Oberholser. (SF .29, SA .78, WF .93, WA 2.93).

1931: Rapid River, June 6-7.

1932: McMillan, January 17-19; Ironwood, January 22-26; Watersmeet, January 31-February 3; Munuskong Bay, June 22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 27; Ironwood, July 18-25, 27; Blaney, July 29.

Seventeen specimens of adults of this species (now in the Museum of Zoology) that were taken throughout the Upper Peninsula and Isle Royale by others as well as by me are referable to *medianus*. Of these, the winter specimens are slightly larger than the breeding specimens, larger than can be accounted for either by variation or by feather wear. In contrast to these seventeen specimens, there are two that are considerably larger than the winter ones mentioned. They are *nelsoni*, as is indicated by the following: two adult females which I collected on January 17, 1932, at McMillan, Luce County (UMMZ no. 68533), and on January 30, 1932, at Watersmeet, Gogebic County (UMMZ no. 68539), respectively, have wings of 99.0, and 98.5 millimeters (arc measurements), and tails of 65.0 and 63.5 millimeters, respectively. These two specimens appear to be the first of this subspecies to be collected in the state.⁶

The evidence from the indexes also substantiates the taxonomic evidence. The winter frequency for the Upper Peninsula of .93 is three times the summer frequency of .29. The winter relative abundance of 2.93 is almost four times the summer abundance of .78. The winter frequency in the Black-River Highlands is .83, which is one and three-tenths times the summer frequency of .67. However, the summer abundance of 2.00 is the same as the winter abundance of 2.00. The first explanation of this seeming anomaly would be that the winter influx is equal to the winter outgo or that there is no winter influx.

⁶ Since the above was written, Dr. Pierce Brodkorb has reported a specimen of *nelsoni* from Whitefish Point, Chippewa County (Auk 53: 455).

However, to be the same both winter and summer, the summer should be *greater* because of the presence of young birds in the woods. It is evident that a winter abundance of 2.00 indicates additional winter birds. The winter frequency bears this out. The smaller frequency of summer indicates a less widespread occurrence of birds. Combined with the same abundance index as in the winter, it can be interpreted as meaning but one thing, *birds in groups*. Birds in groups are the result of family groups of young. It is clear from both the taxonomic and the index evidence that the Downy Woodpecker population of the Upper Peninsula in winter is augmented by an influx of northern birds, some of them *nelsoni*.

ARCTIC THREE-TOED WOODPECKER, *Picoides arcticus* (Swainson). (SF .02, SA .02, WF. 14, WA .14).

1931: Kenton, August 23; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

1932: Ironwood, January 22, 25, July 20.

A young female that I collected northeast of Ironwood, Gogebic County, July 20, 1932, had the feathers of the forehead tipped with bright yellow. The basal portions of the feathers were black, and the area between the black and yellow was white. The yellow faded considerably after a few months in the museum cases.

KINGBIRD, *Tyrannus tyrannus* (Linn.). (SF .68, SA 2 02).
1931: Rapid River, June 6-7.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-25, 27-30, July 2, 4; McFarland, July 5-6; Sturgeon River, July 6-8; Ironwood, July 9, 12, 15-16, 18-24, 26.

CRESTED FLYCATCHER, *Myiarchus crinitus boreus* Bangs. (SF .02, SA .02).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Kenton, August 22.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 26.

EASTERN PHOEBE, *Sayornis phoebe* (Latham). (SF .32, SA 73).
1931: Rapid River, June 6-7; Kenton, August 23; Bruce Crossing, August 24.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 27-28; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 6-8; Ironwood, July 9, 11, 15.

YELLOW-BELLIED FLYCATCHER, *Empidonax flaviventris* (Baird). (SF .02, SA .02).

July 11, 1932, I found a Yellow-bellied Flycatcher in the slashings along a creek in the Black-River Highlands. I shot the bird, but it fell into a tangle of slash and I was unable to find it.

LEAST FLYCATCHER, *Empidonax minimus* (W. M. and S. F. Baird). (SF .49, SA 1.89).

1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 28, July 3; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 6, 8; Ironwood, July 9, 11-13, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26.

ALDER FLYCATCHER, *Empidonax traillii traillii* (Audubon). (SF .20, SA .34).

1931: Kenton, June 6-7; Palmer, Marquette County, June 10.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 24, 26, 28, 29; Ironwood, July 19-20, 26.

EASTERN WOOD PEWEE, *Myiochanes virens* (Linn.). (SF .32, SA .51).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 22-23; Lake Superior State Forest, June 26-28; McFarland, July 5; Ironwood, July 15-16, 18, 20, 25, 27.

OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER, *Nuttallornis mesoleucus* (Licht.) (SF .12, SA .17).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 26, July 4; Ironwood, July 18-20.

PRAIRIE HORNED-LARK, *Otocorus alpestris praticola* Henshaw (SF .15, SA 22).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, July 2, 4; Ironwood, July 12.

TREE SWALLOW, *Iridoprocne bicolor* (Viellot). (SF .24, SA 1.61).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22, Lake Superior State Forest, June 25, 27, 29, July 2, 4, 6-7.

BANK SWALLOW, *Riparia riparia* subsp. (SF .07, SA .17).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22

BARN SWALLOW, *Hirundo erythrogaster* Boddaert. (SF .07, SA .17).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 25, July 4; Kenton, July 9.

CLIFF SWALLOW, *Petrochelidon albifrons* (Raf.). (SF .02, SA .61).

1931: Kenton, August 24.

1932: Kenton, July 9.

PURPLE MARTIN, *Progne subis* (Linn.).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7.

BLUE JAY, *Cyanocitta cristata* subsp. (SF .24, SA .39, WF .07, WA .07).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Alpha, August 28.

1932: McMillan, January 19; St. Ignace, June 20; Lake Superior State Forest, June 26, 28, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 8; Ironwood, July 19-20, 22, 25.

CANADA JAY, *Perisoreus canadensis* subsp. The Canada Jay is local and erratic in occurrence. I have seen none in the Upper Peninsula myself, but many lumberjacks have reported them as seen within a day or two of some of my visits. The lumberjacks generally refer to the Canada Jay as "lumberjack." Herbert Crawford reported to me June 11, 1931, at McFarland that he had seen Canada Jays a few days earlier. He also reported seeing them feeding young during the preceding April. Both the state trapper and the logging boss also reported seeing them almost daily during logging operations in the summer.

RAVEN, *Corvus corax europhilus* Oberholser. (SF. 12, SA .39, WF .29).

1931: Ironwood, January 22-23, 25; Watersmeet, February 2; Ironwood, July 11-13, 15, 16.

This subspecies, although not recognized in the latest edition of the A.O.U. Checklist, is clearly a valid form. *Europhilus* is smaller than either *principalis* or *sinuatus*, a difference born out by the specimens in the Museum of Zoology. In the Michigan specimens, the males have an average wing length of 409.3 mm., and the females an average wing length of 404.3 mm. There is also a more noticeable bluish cast in the Michigan specimens of *europhilus* than in the other two forms. The primaries, on the other hand, are somewhat washed with brownish, perhaps because of immaturity.

Ravens occur in the heaviest timber only. In winter they frequently feed upon offal from deer kills. Sometimes their quarrels over the feast sounded like the chatter of crows. At other times, the only sound was a dull "cr-r-r-oak," or an occasional note resembling the peal of a distant bell.

The stomach of a young female which I collected at Ironwood, July 16, 1932, contained only a great quantity of elderberries (*Sambucus racemosa*).

The fire warden at Melstrand, Alger County, told us that a pair were about the Cusino Swamp regularly and that he thought the birds were nesting nearby.

Crow, *Corvus brachyrhynchos* subsp. (SF .51, SA .85).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Alpha, August 28.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 25, 27-29, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 6-9; Ironwood, July 9, 12, 15, 21-23, 26-27; Blaney, July 29.

BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE, *Penthestes atricapillus atricapillus* (Linn.). (SF .61, SA 2.39, WF .93, WA 12.18).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-8; Kenton, August 22-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26; Alpha, August 28. 1932: McMillan, January 17-19; Ironwood, January 21-28; Watersmeet, February 1-3; Munuskong Bay, June 22, Lake Superior State Forest, June 26-28, July 1, 3-4; McFarland, July 5-6; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 11, 13, 15-16, 18-27.

The Black-capped Chickadee is common throughout the Upper Peninsula. The decided increase in the number of Chickadees in the winter indicates an influx greater than the outgo. The summer frequency of .61 is considerably less than the winter frequency of .93. The summer abundance index of 2.39 is only a fourth of the winter abundance index of 12.18. Young were flying in summer, so that the influx is undoubtedly greater than the index figures show. In the Black-River Highlands, Chickadees have a winter and summer frequency index of 1.00, being plentiful enough to be seen on every field day. The respective winter and summer abundance indexes of 6.40 and 4.89 show that the influx is less in the Black River region than in other parts of the Peninsula or the outgo is greater than elsewhere.

A study of the winter specimens shows that many approach *P. a. septentrionalis* in plumage and size, but the similarity hardly seems close

enough to justify referring them to *septentrionalis*. They are here referred to *atricapillus*, pending further study.

HUDSONIAN CHICKADEE, *Penthestes hudsonicus hudsonicus* (Forster). (SF .02, SA .05).

1932: Blaney, July 20.

Dr. Karl Christofferson, of Blaney Park, showed us a spruce swamp near Blaney where the Hudsonian Chickadees were to be found. The swamp was rather open, and its surface was covered with a deep carpet of sphagnum moss. We found a few of the Chickadees and collected an adult and one young one, July 29, 1932.

WHITE-BREASTED NUTHATCH, *Sitta carolinensis carolinensis* Latham. (SF .12, SA .22, WF .50, WA 1.00).

1931: Montreal River, August 25-26.

1932: McMillan, January 18-19; Ironwood, January 21-23, 25; Watersmeet, February 3; Ironwood, July 11, 19-20, 22.

The index figures show that there is a decided increase in both the frequency of occurrence and the relative abundance in the winter. The winter frequency of .50 is four times the summer frequency of .12, and the winter abundance of 1.00 is about four times the summer abundance of .22. In the Black-River Highlands, however, the winter and the summer indexes remain very close, being .50 and .44 for the frequency, and .83 and .89 for the abundance figures.

RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH, *Sitta canadensis* Linn. (SF .12, SA .15, WF .21, WA 3.29).

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

1932: McMillan, January 17-19, Lake Superior State Forest, June 27; Ironwood, July 19-20, 24-25

January 17-19, 1932, there were many Red-breasted Nuthatches in a grove of hemlocks near the Bryen residence. I saw twenty on January 18. This winter concentration is reflected in the high relative abundance combined with a low frequency, the indexes being 3.29 and .21, respectively.

BROWN CREEPER, *Certhia familiaris americana* Bonaparte. (SF .24, SA .89, WF .29, WA .57).

1932: McMillan, January 17-19; Ironwood, January 25; Lake Superior State Forest, June 26-28; Ironwood, July 13, 15, 18, 21-25.

The Brown Creepers were found in some numbers among the Hemlocks and other trees composing a definite grove near McCormack Lake

at the Bryen home, McMillan, January 17-20, 1932.

WESTERN HOUSE WREN, *Troglodytes aedon parkmani* Audubon. (SF .37, SA 1.07).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26; Alpha, August 28.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 27, July 4; McFarland, July 5-6; Ironwood, July 11-13, 19, 21, 23-24, 26-27.

This form is the breeding race of the western end of the Upper Peninsula and perhaps of the eastern end as well. It is found most often in the slashings, where it frequents the brush piles and fallen tops.

EASTERN WINTER WREN, *Nannus hiemalis hiemalis* (Viellot). (SF .32, SA .73).

1931: Kenton, August 22.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21; Ironwood, July 11, 13, 15-16, 18, 21-27.

The winter wren is usually associated with hemlock groves. In fact, one might almost say that every grove of virgin hemlock harbors one or more pairs of winter wrens.

LONG-BILLED MARSH WREN, *Telmatodytes palustris* (Wilson). I found several in a wet marsh at the upper end of a beaver pond near McFarland, Marquette County, June 10, 1931. Poachers cut the dam in order to obtain the beavers, causing the pond and marsh to become dry in 1932. No marsh wrens could be found there in 1932.

SHORT-BILLED MARSH WREN, *Cistothorus stellaris* (Naum.) (SF .17, SA 1.37).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; McFarland, June 10.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22, McFarland, July 4-5; Ironwood, July 12, 22; St Ignace, July 30.

The Short-billed Marsh Wren is abundant in favorable places. Such places are generally distributed throughout the farming regions but are usually restricted to beaver-pond sites or along alkaline meadows elsewhere.

BROWN THRASHER, *Toxostoma rufum* (Linn.).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7.

EASTERN ROBIN, *Turdus migratorius migratorius* Linn. (SF .83, SA 4.80).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Kenton, August 23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26; Alpha, August 28.
1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-30, July 3-4; McFarland, July 5-6; Sturgeon River, July 6-8; Ironwood, July 9-13, 15-16, 18-27.

The robin is universally distributed, although rarely found in virgin timber. It is most often associated with human habitations, probably attracted by the clearings made in the course of farming. It is seen more often in the slashings than in the timber but less often than in the cleared lands.

EASTERN HERMIT THRUSH, *Hylocichla guttata faxoni* Bangs and Penard. (SF .71, SA 2.02).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 9, 13, 15-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25-27.

The Hermit Thrushes sang regularly during June and early July. The last one was heard July 23, 1932.

OLIVE-BACKED THRUSH, *Hylocichla ustulata swainsoni* (Tschudi). (SF .02, SA .02).

1932: Ironwood, July 18.

I found the nest of an Olive-backed Thrush in the deep woods along a stream in the Black-River Highlands, July 18. The nest, which was located about two feet above the ground in a small maple sprout, contained four eggs.

WILLOW THRUSH, *Hylocichla fuscescens salicicola* Ridgway. (SF .10, SA .12).

1932: Sturgeon River, July 8; Ironwood, July 9, 18-19.

The song of the Willow Thrush, to my ears, can be likened to but one thing: the bull-cook of a lumber camp calling the lumberjacks to "chow" by striking a piece of a broken circular saw, a dinner "bell" often used in logging camps.

EASTERN BLUEBIRD, *Sialia sialis sialis* (Linn.). (SF .63, SA 1.29).
1931: Rapid River, June 5-6, Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 9, 12-13, 15, 18, 21, 23-24, 26.

GOLDEN-CROWNED KINGLET, *Regulus satrapa satrapa* Lich. (SF .07, SA .20, WF .21, WA 1.00).

1931: Kenton, August 22.

1932: McMillan, January 18; Ironwood, January 22, 24, July 20, 25-26.

CEDAR WAXWING, *Bombycilla cedrorum* Viellot.

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26; Alpha, August 28.

MIGRANT SHRIKE, *Lanius ludovicianus migrans* Palmer. (SF .10, SA .20).

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21; Ironwood, July 12, 26.

STARLING, *Sturnus vulgaris* Linn. (SF .12, SA .85).

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25.

1932: Newberry, June 23; Lake Superior State Forest, June 27; McMillan, July 4; McFarland, July 5-6.

BLUE-HEADED VIREO, *Vireo solitarius solitarius* (Wilson). (SF .10, SA .29).

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 26, 28, July 3.

The Blue-headed Vireo lives in the heavier growths of Jack Pine. I found it at the Munuskong Bay State Park, June 22, 1932. A few days later, June 26, 1932, I found a nest under construction at the Lake Superior State Forest, twenty-six miles northwest of Newberry. The birds had chosen a thirty-five-foot Jack Pine tree for attaching the pensile nest, which was in the fork of a horizontal branch twenty feet from the ground and three feet from the trunk of the tree. Lichens and shreds of birch bark composed the framework of the nest, and thin dry grasses served for lining. The nest measured 50 mm. across the rim and 40 mm. deep when completed. On July 3, a bird was incubating; it proved later to have been a male. The female returned to the nest shortly after we obtained the male. The nest contained four eggs on July 3.

The Vireos were very tame, the male leaving the nest only after we shook the tree and the nest vigorously. The birds were very quiet, not only the nesting pair but others which we encountered. They seemed to slip noiselessly about the woods, giving little notice of their approach. The song is a liquid whistle. They also have a scolding note, that of the female being pitched lower than that of the male.

RED-EYED VIREO, *Vireo olivaceus* (Linn.). (SF .44, SA 1.12).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Bruce Crossing, August 23; Montreal River, August 25-26.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 27; Lake Superior State Forest, June 27-28; McFarland, July 4; Sturgeon River, July 8; Ironwood, July 9-11, 13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-26.

BLACK AND WHITE WARBLER, *Mniotilta varia* (Linn.). (SF .12, SA .20).

1931: Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: Ironwood, July 18-20, 25, 27.

TENNESSEE WARBLER, *Vermivora peregrina* (Wilson)

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24; Alpha, August 28.

NASHVILLE WARBLER, *Vermivora ruficapilla ruficapilla* (Wils.). (SF 24, SA .56).

1931: Rapid River, June 6; Montreal River, August 26; Alpha, August 28.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 24, 26-30, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7.

MAGNOLIA WARBLER, *Dendroica magnolia* (Wilson). (SF .05, SA .12).

1932: Ironwood, July 20, 25.

BLACK-THROATED GREEN WARBLER, *Dendroica virens virens* (Gmelin). (SF .37, SA 1.39).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-28, 30, July 2-4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 8; Ironwood, July 13, 21, 25.

The Black-throated Green Warbler is quite common in the heavy Cedar and Spruce swamps. It is also found in the heavy hardwood forest.

BLACK-THROATED BLUE WARBLER, *Dendroica caerulescens caerulescens* (Gmelin) (SF .17, SA .27).

1931: Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: Ironwood, July 11, 13, 16, 18, 23, 25-26.

MYRTLE WARBLER, *Dendroica coronata coronata* (Linn.). (SF .24, SA .83).

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-28, 30, July 2-4.

BLACKBURNIAN WARBLER, *Dendroica fusca* (Müller). (SF .02, SA .05).

1931: Montreal River Mouth, August 25.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 17.

CHESTNUT-SIDED WARBLER, *Dendroica pensylvanica* (Linn.). (SF .22, SA .37).

1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: McFarland, July 4, Sturgeon River, July 7; Ironwood, July 11, 13, 15-16, 19-20, 25.

BLACK-POLL WARBLER, *Dendroica striata* (Forster). I observed a bird of this species perched on a dead stub in a narrow creek-bottom near Rapid River, June 6, 1931. It sang the typical weak song. I was not able to secure the bird.

OVENBIRD, *Seiurus aurocapillus* (Linn.). (SF .68, SA 2 07).

1931: Rapid River, June 6.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 22-July 2, 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 9, 11, 15-16, 18-19, 22-27

WATER-THRUSH, *Seiurus noveboracensis*, subsp. (SF .07, SA .17).

1932: Ironwood, July 18-20.

MOURNING WARBLER, *Oporornis philadelphia* (Wils.). (SF .24, SA .56).

1931: Kenton, August 22-23; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

1932: Ironwood, July 11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 23, 25-27.

CONNECTICUT WARBLER, *Oporornis agilis* (Wils.). The Connecticut Warbler has been recorded as breeding in Michigan, the record being based upon two females collected July 27 and August 4, 1904, in the Porcupine Mountains, Ontonagon County, by William A. McLean.⁷ I have examined the two specimens (UMMZ nos. 31832 and 31833, respectively) and find them to be the Mourning Warbler, *Oporornis philadelphia* (Wils.), which breeds in the Upper Peninsula. It is unfortunate that these specimens were incorrectly identified, as the error definitely placed Michigan within the breeding range of *agilis*. There are a few sight records that indicate its presence during the breeding season, but we cannot assign it to the state until the records are substantiated by breeding specimens.

⁷ Wood, Auk, 22: 178; Wood, Peet, and McCreary in. "An Ecological Survey of Northern Michigan," State Geological Survey Report 1905, p. 119

NORTHERN YELLOW-THROAT, *Geothlypis trichas brachidactyla* (Swain.). (SF .20, SA .32).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7, Alpha, August 28.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 27; McFarland, July 5; Ironwood, July 19-21, 25.

CANADA WARBLER, *Wilsonia canadensis* (Linn.). (SF .05, SA .15).
1932: Ironwood, July 23, 25.

REDSTART, *Setophaga ruticilla* (Linn.). (SF .05, SA .10).

1931: Kenton, August 21-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 22; Ironwood, July 16.

ENGLISH SPARROW, *Passer domesticus* (Linn.). English Sparrows are not common anywhere in the Upper Peninsula, although they are seen about the towns and some of the farms.

BOBOLINK, *Dolichonyx oryzivorus* (Linn.). (SF .15, SA .32).

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 27; Ironwood, July 9, 15.

EASTERN MEADOWLARK, *Sturnella magna magna* (Linn.). (SF .32, SA 1.61).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; McFarland, June 10; Kenton, August 22-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River, August 25-26.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 25; Newberry, July 4; McFarland, July 5-6; Ironwood, July 9-10, 12, 15, 22, 24, 26.

WESTERN MEADOWLARK, *Sturnella neglecta* Audubon. (SF .02, SA .07).

The Eastern Meadowlark is the common Meadowlark of the Upper Peninsula. However, on July 12, 1932, I found some Meadowlarks in a pasture field opposite the Gogebic County airport, five and one-half miles northeast of Ironwood. I heard the song of the Western Meadowlark and succeeded in collecting a male and one young bird. The Eastern Meadowlarks were also present, and I collected one a few yards from the spot where I obtained the Western species. The Eastern Meadowlark was the shyer of the two species, a habit which may be characteristic.

YELLOW-HEADED BLACKBIRD, *Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus* (Bona.).

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24.

I saw two male Yellow-headed Blackbirds at Bruce Crossing but was not able to collect them. They were with a flock of about forty Grackles.

RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD, *Agelaius phoeniceus phoeniceus* (Linn.). (SF .17, SA .98).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Alpha, August 28.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 25, July 4; Sturgeon River, July 8; Ironwood, July 9.

All the breeding specimens of the Upper Peninsula prove to be of this subspecies, although somewhat larger than typical specimens.

BREWER'S BLACKBIRD, *Euphagus cyanocephalus* (Wagler). (SF .02, SA .02). The Brewer's Blackbird has not been recorded in Michigan. I collected an adult female in a rocky pasture north of Ironwood, July 26, 1932. It acted as though nesting, but I failed to locate a nest.

BRONZED GRACKLE, *Quiscalis quiscula aeneus* Ridgway. (SF .29, SA .61).

1931: Rapid River, June 6-7; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20, Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 25, 28-29, July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7; Ironwood, July 9, 15.

EASTERN COWBIRD, *Molothrus ater ater* (Boddaert). (SF .29, SA .85).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6; Montreal River, August 25.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Lake Superior State Forest, July 1, 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 6-7; Ironwood, July 15, 21-24, 26.

SCARLET TANAGER, *Piranga erythromelas* Vieillot. (SF .15, SA .17). 1931: Kenton, August 23.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, July 3-4; McFarland, July 5; Ironwood, July 11, 18-19.

ROSE-BREASTED GROSBEAK, *Hedymeles ludovicianus* (Linn.). (SF .17, SA .37).

1931: Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

1932: Ironwood, July 13, 16, 18-20, 25-26.

INDIGO BUNTING, *Passerina cyanea* (Linn.). (SF .24, SA .42).
1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 27, July 5, 9, 11-13, 19, 21, 25, 27.

EVENING GROSBEEK, *Hesperiphona vespertina vespertina* (Cooper).
(SF .29, SA 4.51, WF .02).

1931: McFarland, June 12.

1932: McMillan, January 18, Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4.

This species has been seen several times in the Upper Peninsula by various observers and nests have been found. I collected a pair near McFarland, June 12, 1931.^a Mr. Wood and I found them in Luce County, twenty-six miles north of Newberry, June 23 to July 4, 1932. They came regularly to a block of salt placed in a pasture for cattle. They could be found in numbers at the salt block during any hour of the day. At several points within ten miles of the salt, I observed Grosbeaks flying in its direction. We searched for nests but found none. The gonads of the 1931 female showed that she would have laid eggs within a short time (as they were considerably enlarged). The gonads of the females collected in 1932 were also enlarged.

The fire warden at Melstrand, Alger County, reported that Grosbeaks came regularly to his cabin. They had been there the morning of our visit, July 4, 1932. Local residents also reported them at Sidnaw. Here the Grosbeaks picked over the ground where ice-cream freezers had been emptied, evidently attracted by the salt used with the ice.

An interesting change occurs in the bill. It is yellow in the winter but becomes a dark green in both sexes during the breeding season. The color varies in the specimens, ranging from yellow-green to olive. The color does not fade greatly after the specimen is made up.

PURPLE FINCH, *Carpodacus purpureus purpureus* (Gmelin). (SF .49, SA 2.32).

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 25-July 4; Sturgeon River, July 7; Ironwood, July 12-14, 19-21, 25-26.

The Purple Finches were attracted to the salt block at the Lake Superior State Forest along with the Evening Grosbeaks. At Ironwood, I also found many of them attracted to a deer lick.

^a Wing, 1931, Auk, 48: 618.

NEWFOUNDLAND PINE GROSBEEK, *Pinicola enucleator eschatosus* Oberholser; CANADIAN PINE GROSBEEK, *Pinicola enucleator leucura* (Müller). (WF .14, WA 1.43).

The Pine Grosbeaks were common at McMillan in January, 1932, and fed upon maple buds. Nearly all were in the gray plumage.

Mr. W. E. C. Todd, Carnegie Museum, very kindly compared specimens of the Upper Peninsula birds with his extensive series. He identifies both *eschatosus* and *leucura*.⁹ I saw a bird at Ironwood, July 19, 1932, which I am certain was a Pine Grosbeak, although I was unable to secure it. It was in a virgin-timber area near a deer lick.

REDPOLL, *Acanthis linaria* subsp. (WF .07).

1932: McMillan, January 18.

PINE SISKIN, *Spinus pinus pinus* (Wils.). (SF 10, SA .66, WF .14).

1932: McMillan, January 18-19; Lake Superior State Forest, June 28-29; Ironwood, July 19, 25.

EASTERN GOLDFINCH, *Spinus tristis tristis* (Linn.). (SF .46, SA 1.15, WF .14, WA 1.79).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6; Bruce Crossing, June 24, Montreal River Mouth, August 26.

1932: McMillan, January 19; Lake Superior State Forest, June 24-25, 29, July 4; McFarland, July 5-6; Ironwood, July 11, 13, 15-16, 18-26.

RED CROSSBILL,¹⁰ *Loxia curvirostra pusilla* Gloger, *L. c. benti*

⁹ That *eschatosus* is commoner than *leucura* in winter in both peninsulas of Michigan as well as in Ohio has been reported since by Doctor Van Tyne (1934, Auk, 51: 529).

¹⁰ Since the preparation of the original manuscript for this report, Mr. Ludlow Griscom has examined the specimens which I collected in the Upper Peninsula, and has used them in connection with his recent revision of the Red Crossbills (Proc. Bost. Soc. Nat. Hist., 41: 77-210). I have changed the identification originally made and have followed his. I collected three birds at McMillan, Luce County (not Lane County, as given by Mr. Griscom), January 17, 1932. Mr. Griscom identifies one as *L. c. pusilla* Gloger (UMMZ no. 68574), and one as *L. c. benti* Griscom (UMMZ no. 68573); the third was preserved as a skeleton. The three specimens came from the same small flock. I am inclined to think that both specimens (Nos. 68574 and 68573) are *L. c. benti* Griscom. I washed the bird identified as *benti* in 1932, but not the one identified as *pusilla*, the birds being identical before they were washed. It is possible that the apparent difference in race is the result of the removal of soiling from the plumage of the bird identified as *benti* but not from the plumage of the bird identified as *pusilla*.

I collected a male on July 19, 1932, and a female on July 25, 1932, at Ironwood. Mr. Griscom identifies them as *L. c. neogaea* Griscom. These birds were attracted by the same natural deer lick.

Griscom, *L. c. neogaea* Griscom. (SF .10, SA .37, WF .36, WA .5.14).

1932: McMillan, January 17-19; Ironwood, January 22; Watersmeet, February 3; Lake Superior State Forest, June 28; Ironwood, July 19-20, 25.

WHITE-WINGED CROSSBILL, *Loxia leucoptera* Gmelin. (SF .02, SA .05, WF .07).

1932: McMillan, January 18; Ironwood, July 25.

July 25, 1932, I secured a pair of White-winged Crossbills at the same natural salt lick that attracted the Red Crossbills. The White-winged Crossbills were not so restless in their actions as the Red Crossbills. They flew silently to the lower branches overhanging the lick. The Red Crossbills, on the other hand, always announced their approach by means of loud calls and always perched in the tops of the Spruce trees before descending to the lick.

RED-EYED TOWHEE, *Pipilo erythrophthalmus erythrophthalmus* (Linn.). (SF .02, SA .10).

1931: Rapid River, June 5; Alpha, August 28.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, July 4.

SAVANNAH SPARROW, *Passerculus sandwichensis savanna* (Wilson). (SF .37, SA 1.78).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-6; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25.

1932: St. Ignace, June 2; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23; McMillan, June 25; McFarland, July 4-5; Ironwood, July 9-10, 12, 15, 22-24.

VESPER SPARROW, *Poocetes gramineus gramineus* (Gmelin). (SF 54, SA 1.49).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Alpha, August 28.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-28, 30, July 2, 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-8; Ironwood, July 9, 15, 21-24, 26.

SLATE-COLORED JUNCO, *Junco hyemalis hyemalis* (Linn.). (SF .42, SA 2.20).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7.

1932: Lake Superior State Forest, June 26-July 4; McFarland, July 5; Sturgeon River, July 7-9; Ironwood, July 18-20, 25.

Juncos are found wherever suitable conditions exist. They were abundant in the Jack Pine and brushy areas of the Lake Superior State Forest. I also found them in similar habitats at Rapid River.

June 18-20, 1932, I studied a small colony of Juncos in a grove of virgin hemlock in the Black-River Highlands. July 25, 1932, Juncos were found near a salt lick on Sandy Creek. These were the only ones found at Ironwood. There were no Jack Pine areas in the region northeast of Ironwood where I worked. Their absence, as well as the absence of Spruce and Sphagnum swamps, was probably responsible for the scarcity of Juncos.

Juncos are found wherever suitable conditions exist. They were abundant in the Jack Pine and brushy areas of the Lake Superior State Forest. I also found them in similar habitats at Rapid River.

June 18-20, 1932, I studied a small colony of Juncos in a grove of virgin hemlock in the Black-River Highlands. July 25, 1932, Juncos were found near a salt lick on Sandy Creek. These were the only ones found at Ironwood. There were no Jack Pine areas in the region northwest of Ironwood where I worked. Their absence, as well as the absence of Spruce and Sphagnum swamps were probably responsible for the lack of Juncos.

CHIPPING SPARROW, *Spizella passerina passerina* (Bech.). (SF .54, SA 2.85).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Montreal River Mouth, August 25; Alpha, August 28.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-July 4; Sturgeon River, July 6, 8-9; Ironwood, July 11, 15-16, 22, 24-25.

CLAY-COLORED SPARROW, *Spizella pallida* (Swainson). (SF .02, SA .07).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Alpha, August 28.

1932: Ironwood, July 21.

Clay-colored Sparrows seem to occupy a variety of habitats. At Ironwood and Rapid River, Clay-colored Sparrows were found in wet, brushy pastures along with Song Sparrows. They also occupied dry sand ridges and plains covered with scattered Aspen, Birch, and Jack Pine, and deciduous brush at Rapid River. Along the east side of Little Bay de Noc, near Rapid River, they were found in Scrub Oak areas.

FIELD SPARROW, *Spizella pusilla* subsp.

1931: Rapid River, June 5.

WHITE-THROATED SPARROW, *Zonotrichia albicollis* (Gmelin). (SF .68, SA 7.22).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-7; Kenton, August 22-23; Bruce Crossing, August 24; Montreal River Mouth, August 25-26.

1932: Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 25, 27, 29-30, July 4; McFarland, July 5-6; Sturgeon River, July 7; Ironwood, July 10-16, 18-27, 29.

SWAMP SPARROW, *Melospiza georgiana* (Latham). (SF .37, SA 1.17).

1931: Kenton, August 22.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23, 27-30; McFarland, July 5-6; Ironwood, July 13, 19-20; Blaney, July 29.

DAKOTA SONG SPARROW, *Melospiza melodia juddi* Bishop. (SF .85, SA 8.29).

1931: Rapid River, June 5-9; McFarland, June 10-11; Michigamme, June 11.

1932: St. Ignace, June 20; Munuskong Bay, June 21-22; Lake Superior State Forest, June 23-27, 29-30, July 2; McFarland, July 4-5; Sturgeon River, July 6-8; Ironwood, July 9-16, 18-27; Blaney, July 29.

The Song Sparrow is a common bird in suitable localities. Song Sparrows live along the creek bottoms and lake margins, "tag-alder" swamps, beaver meadows, and other similar places. They are also commonly found in the damp parts of cut-over lands and in the tall grass and timothy hay of tote roads and logging camp sites, even in the heavy timber.

The Song Sparrow of the western end of the Upper Peninsula is the western form, *M. m. juddi* Bishop. The birds of the eastern end seem nearer *M. m. beata* Bangs. A report on the Michigan Song Sparrows has been published recently by Mr. William G. Fargo.¹¹

SNOW BUNTING, *Plectrophenax nivalis nivalis* (Linn.). (WF .21, WA 1.31).

1932: McMillan, January 17-19.

¹¹ 1932, Auk, 49 208-211

STUDIES OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF SOME FEATURES OF WHEAT GLUMES TO RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING AND OF THE USE OF GLUME STRENGTH AS A TOOL IN SELECTING FOR HIGH RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING¹

ORVILLE A. VOGEL

PART I

A STUDY OF THE RELATION OF THE AMOUNTS OF MECHANICAL TISSUE IN THE BASAL PORTION OF THE GLUMES TO RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING IN WHEAT²

In general the amounts of mechanical tissue in the basal portion of the glumes of 11 varieties of common wheat and one of emmer were found to be related directly to resistance to shattering. The technic involved in this study proved costly and impracticable. Therefore a new and more practical study involving the strength of the glumes, instead of the amount of mechanical tissue, was developed, the results of which are covered in Part II.

PART II

STUDIES OF THE STRENGTH OF WHEAT GLUMES AS RELATED TO RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING AND OF THE USE OF GLUME STRENGTH AS A TOOL IN THE BREEDING AND SELECTING FOR HIGH RESISTANCE TO SHATTERING

The glumes on the fertile spikelets located at the lower portion of the wheat head were found to be considerably stronger than on those located between the middle and the top. The second glume of each spikelet was generally stronger than the first. Each of the various varieties of wheat appeared to have its own characteristic locations of weak and strong glumes in the head. These characteristic distributions of glume strengths were taken into consideration in the study of the relationship of glume strength to resistance to shattering among the various varieties.

A direct relationship of glume strength to resistance to shattering was found among varieties of wheat which had similar morphological characters, particularly those of the head. In cases where the relative

¹ Abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Agronomy, State College of Washington (1939).

² Published as "The Relation of Lignification of the Outer Glume to Resistance to Shattering in Wheat." Jour Amer Soc. Agron. 30 599-603. 1938.

difference in strengths of comparably located glumes of any two varieties of wheat did not correspond directly with their relative differences in resistance to shattering, the discrepancies appeared to be due to the differences in one or more of the many plant characters which also affect resistance to shattering.

The club (dense) type and the dense portions of the clavate type of head were found to have considerably lower glume strengths for a given degree of resistance to shattering than did the lax types or lax portions of other types, all other characters being equal.

On the basis of these results the selection for high resistance to shattering by means of glume strength data can be simplified considerably by working within a limited number of plant types, inasmuch as the number of variables involved is thereby reduced.

Investigations of the effect of growing conditions upon glume strength showed a more or less independent reaction of the varieties to the various growing conditions. Size of head was not significantly correlated with glume strength in all samples. Such an independence of reaction, as well as a wide variation of glume strength among individual heads of a given sample, indicates that selection for high resistance to shattering by the glume strength method should not be limited to a single sample of heads.

The glume strength of heads harvested in the late milk stage of growth was not significantly different from that of heads harvested at maturity. Apparently, therefore, reliable glume strength data may be obtained from material harvested at the earlier stage of maturity, in which case the heads will not be damaged by strong winds, as is often the situation with heads harvested at or near maturity.

The variations of glume strength among the parents and F_2 progenies of three closely related crosses were such that the inheritance of glume strength could not be analyzed reliably. Additional and more comparable data are needed.

THE STAGE POPULARITY OF *THE REHEARSAL*, 1671-1777

EMMETT L. AVERY
Assistant Professor of English

In his study of *The Rehearsal* and allied types of drama,¹ Mr. D. F. Smith has given in Appendix D a list of revivals in the eighteenth century of several plays which are discussed in the earlier chapters. Among these is *The Rehearsal*, Buckingham's play, which is treated at considerable length in Chapter II. In his demonstration of the popularity of *The Rehearsal* during the hundred years after its first performance, Mr. Smith has listed a total of 171 performances during the period from 1671 to 1777. In spite of the large number of performances there listed, the table represents a considerable understatement of the popularity of the play. The following list attempts to give all the performances of *The Rehearsal* during that period; in it I have starred the dates which Mr. Smith has overlooked. It will be seen that the performances here noted increase the total number of presentations of the piece during the period from 1671 to 1777 from 171 to 291, an increase of about seventy per cent.²

1671: T.R. December 7, 14

1674: D.L. December 21, 28.

1686: D.L. May 6

1687: D.L. January 20.

1704: D.L. November 18, 21 December 1.

1705: D.L. January 4 February 2. November 5

1706: D.L. January 28. December 3

1707: D.L. March 20 November 18.

1708: D.L. February 12

1709: D.L. January 18. Queen's: November 18.

1710: D.L. December 18.

1711: D.L. January 29 October 26.

1712: D.L. February 25*

1717: D.L. February 7, 8, 9, 20, 23 March 21, 28. October 17.

1718: D.L. February 3* November 17.

1719: D.L. November 25

¹ *Plays about the Theatre in England from The Rehearsal in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737*, Oxford University Press, 1936.

² The performances here listed have been taken from the theatrical advertisements in the newspapers and playbills in the British Museum and the playbills in the Huntington Library; it is possible that an occasional projected performance did not actually take place. The abbreviations used are as follows: T. R.—Theatre Royal. D.L.—Drury Lane. Queen's—Queen's Theatre in the Haymarket. C.G.—Covent Garden. G.F.—Goodman's Fields. L.I.F.—Lincoln's Inn Fields. Hay—Little Theatre in the Haymarket (Summer Theatre).

- 1720: D.L. September 27. November 23*.
 1721: D.L. January 18*. November 15.
 1722: D.L. January 15*.
 1723: D.L. January 28. November 29.
 1724: D.L. March 7*. November 18. December 1*.
 1725: D.L. January 29*. November 9.
 1726: D.L. November 14*.
 1727: D.L. January 2*, 26. December 1*.
 1728: D.L. March 30*, November 1*. December 13.
 1729: D.L. September 16*.
 1730: D.L. January 23. October 29. November 19*.
 1731: D.L. January 18*. October 26. December 15*.
 1732: D.L. March 4*. April 25*. September 8. November 8*. December 15*.
 1733: D.L. January 17. May 30.
 1734: D.L. October 31.
 1736: D.L. January 8*. February 6.
 1739: C.G. October 10, 11*, 12*, 13*, 15*, 16*, 17*, 18*, 19*, 20*, 27*, 31*, November 3*, 8*, 14*, 19*, 21*, 23*, 26*. December 1*, 3*, 7*, 14*, 18*, 28*.
 1740: C.G. January 5*, 12*, 19*, 26*. February 2*, 4*, 9*. March 13*. April 10*, 15*, 24*. May 1*, 8*, 22*, 30*. June 5, 10, 13. September 19. October 18*. November 3*, 17*. December 3*, 18*.
 1741: C.G. February 16*, 21*. March 3*, 14*, 21*, 31*. April 14, 24*, 29*. October 21*, 22*. D.L. November 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27*. December 4*, 26*.¹
 1742: D.L. January 25. G.F. February 3, 4, 5. D.L. February 6*. G.F. February 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23. March 9. C.G. March 29. G.F. April 28. May 7, 26. D.L. October 7, 8, 20. November 2. L.I.F. December 6*. D.L. December 7. L.I.F. December 8*. D.L. December 16.
 1743: D.L. January 7, 17, 29. February 3, 28. March 7. April 4, 30. May 6. December 6, 8, 9, 28*.
 1744: D.L. March 15*. April 12*. May 28*. October 19. December 27*.
 1745: G.F. January 7*, 8*, 10*, 14*. D.L. January 16*. G.F. February 7*, 8*. March 14*. D.L. December 13. C.G. December 13, 19, 26.
 1746: D.L. January 24. C.G. May 2. November 6, 7. December 18.
 1747: C.G. January 13. G.F. March 23*. C.G. November 23, 24.
 1748: C.G. February 5.
 1749: D.L. December 20, 21, 22.
 1750: D.L. January 4*. February 14*.²

¹The performances which Smith lists for C.G. May 19, 1741, and for D.L. May 26, 1741, apparently were not given; see Ad. Ms. 32,248-32,251. Smith lists a performance for November 22, 1741, but this date would be Sunday; instead there was a performance on November 27, with the revival totaling six consecutive performances.

²The performances listed by Smith for April 26 and 27, 1750, and May 3, 1751, were not presentations of Buckingham's play but of Mrs. Clive's *The Rehearsal; or Bayes in Petticoats*.

- 1752: D.L. December 8, 9, 12, 13, 16.
 1753: D.L. February 3, 26*. May 21.^a
 1754: C.G. December 30, 31.
 1755: C.G. January 1. February 11*, 25*. April 14, 21 Hay September 11, 15,
 D.L. October 17, 18. November 5*, 27*. December 19*.
 1756: D.L. February 9*. May 15*. November 18.
 1757: D.L. September 29. October 22*. November 25.*
 1759: D.L. May 25. October 30. November 23*.
 1760: D.L. March 13*. May 2. October 3. December 12*
 1761: D.L. May 22*. September 14
 1762: D.L. March 2. November 10.*
 1763: D.L. April 21*. Hay August 1, 11, 20.
 1765: D.L. April 13. May 6. Hay. August 30.
 1766: D.L. December 4*.
 1767: D.L. April 25. C G September 14, 15.
 1768: Richmond. July 27*, 30*. Hay September 19*.
 1771: D.L. April 6.
 1772: D.L. March 26, 31. Hay August 10*, 24*, 31*. D.L. October 21 De-
 cember 7.
 1773: Hay June 18*, 23* July 19*.
 1774: D L. March 14 April 8 Hay. June 27* July 11*. C G October 11
 1775: Hay July 31* August 7.
 1776: D L. May 11. Hay. August 2
 1777: Hay August 25, 27. D L. December 13*, 15*

The following year, 1778, saw *The Rehearsal* condensed to a three-act play and the close of its greatest popularity.

The acting of the play may be most conveniently divided into five periods. Of the first, 1671-87, we know very little, except that there were at least six performances. After 1700 interest centers chiefly in the actor who performed Bayes. From 1700 to 1712 that person was Richard Estcourt, who probably acted in all the seventeen performances during those years, although the advertisements do not always name the actors playing the parts. From 1717 to 1736 Bayes was performed by Colley Cibber, perhaps on every occasion, although the cast was not always advertised; at the most he could have appeared in the part on forty-seven occasions. With the retirement of Cibber *The Rehearsal* was dropped from the repertories of the theaters for a short time, but

^a The performance listed for May 4, 1753, was also Mrs. Clive's piece

^b The performance listed for April 21, 1757, apparently was not given.
 1758: C.G. January 24. D L. May 19*. November 16'

^c The performance on November 16 is misdated November 15 by Smith.

^d The performance listed for March 22, 1762, also was *The Rehearsal*, or *Bayes in Petticoats*.

in 1739 a genuine revival of interest in it began, a revival which lasted a number of years. In the short period from 1739 to 1747 two performers were rivals in acting Bayes: Theophilus Cibber and David Garrick. Once again one cannot be absolutely certain of the cast of all the performances, which totalled 135 in nine seasons, but it seems that Theophilus Cibber acted Bayes 74 times and Garrick 45 times. Six other performers attempted the rôle during the same period, but no one of them was nearly so popular as Cibber or Garrick. Dance, a minor performer, acted Bayes eight times⁹; Chapman acted it on three evenings; Foote played the rôle four times; Catherine Clive attempted it on one occasion; and an unknown actor appeared once. By 1748 the rivalry of Cibber and Garrick had lessened, for Garrick acted the part not at all that year and Cibber played it but once.

From 1748 to 1777 the play declined in popularity, there being only eighty-six performances in nearly thirty years. During this period the part of Bayes was chiefly Garrick's, for he acted it forty-three times. Theophilus Cibber appeared for eight performances before 1756, but Foote acted the part eleven times, chiefly in the Summer Theatre in the Haymarket. The other performers acted Bayes as follows: Shuter, five; Love, five¹⁰; Henderson, four; King, four; Lee, three; Wilkinson, three. With the retirement of Garrick in 1776, the last great performer of Bayes disappeared from the part, and the play lost a great deal of its popularity.

In the number of performances as well, Garrick leads the group. From 1742 to his retirement he played Bayes on eighty-eight occasions; Theophilus Cibber almost equals Garrick's record with a probable total of eighty-two appearances as Bayes. Colley Cibber is third, with forty-seven performances. Twelve other performers divide the remaining sixty performances in the eighteenth century, with Samuel Foote and Richard Estcourt as the only ones to stand very clearly above the others.

⁹ It is not certain that Dance performed the part eight times, but in Goodman's Fields in the spring of 1741 a "Gentleman" was advertised for the part of Bayes. For the seventh performance the name of Dance appears in the bills; it seems likely that he had been the "Gentleman" earlier advertised. He acted it once more in Covent Garden in 1746.

¹⁰ Love is the name assumed by James Dance, who in earlier years had acted Bayes in Goodman's Fields.

RESEARCH STUDIES OF THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Volume VII

1939



Published at the State College of Washington
Pullman, Washington

RESEARCH STUDIES
of the
STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

PAUL P. KIES, *Professor of English*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CARL M. BREWSTER,
Professor of Organic Chemistry

CARL I. ERICKSON,
Associate Professor of Psychology

HERMAN J. DEUTSCH,
Associate Professor of History

RONALD F. MACLENNAN,
Associate Professor of Zoology

Entered as second-class matter December 26, 1936, at the post office at Pullman, Washington, under Act of August 24, 1912.

Research Studies of the State College of Washington is published in Pullman, Washington, by the State College of Washington. It is issued four times a year—in March, June, September, and December.

PURPOSE. *Research Studies* is established to provide a medium of publication for articles of research in the pure sciences and arts; it is limited to material making a contribution to knowledge. Its pages are open to the faculty and the advanced students of the State College of Washington.

MANUSCRIPTS. Authors who wish to publish in *Research Studies* should submit their manuscripts to Paul P. Kies, Room 305, College Hall, Pullman, Washington. Though no strict limit is set as to the maximum number of pages or the nature or number of illustrations, authors are reminded that the papers must be actual research. Long introductions, unnecessary comments, and repetitions are not acceptable. Authors who will assume the expense may arrange for the inclusion of extra pages, tables, or illustrations.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. *Research Studies* will be mailed postpaid to subscribers for two dollars a year. Subscriptions are payable in advance to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U. S. A.

EXCHANGE. *Research Studies* is offered in exchange to other colleges, universities, learned societies, and libraries. Publications sent in return should be addressed to the Exchange Department, Library, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U. S. A. At present all back numbers and title pages can still be supplied.

SINGLE NUMBERS. Single numbers will be sold or exchanged as long as available; orders should be addressed to *Research Studies*, Correspondence Office, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U. S. A. For prices of back numbers (with the list of articles in each number), see the page following the "Contents of Volume VII" and pages 119-20 of Volume VII.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII

ACKERMAN, ROBERT W.: Armor and Weapons in the Middle English Romances	104
AVERY, EMMETT L.: <i>The Craftsman of July 2, 1737, and Colley Cibber</i>	90
AVERY, EMMETT L.: <i>The Stage Popularity of The Rehearsal, 1671-1777</i>	201
BLINN, HAROLD E.: The French Labor Movement 1880-95.....	59
BOTTING, ROLAND B.: Christopher Smart in London.....	3
JOHNSON, FOLKE: Viroses of the Garden Pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) in Washington [abstract].....	155
McELDERRY, B. R., JR.: Victorian Evaluation of <i>The Ring and the Book</i>	75
MOTTERN, HUGH H.: The Preparation of Galacturonic and Mucic Acids from Pectic Substances [abstract].....	153
PRATT, LYNDON U.: An Addition to the Canon of Stephen Crane....	55
SHARSMITH, CARL W.: New or Otherwise Noteworthy Northwestern Plants—III.....	159
VOGEL, ORVILLE A.: Studies of the Relationships of Some Features of Wheat Glumes to Resistance to Shattering and of the Use of Glume Strength as a Tool in Selecting for High Resistance to Shattering [abstract].....	199
WELLMAN, RICHARD: Studies on the Control of Blue-Mold Decay of Apples [abstract].....	157
WING, LEONARD: Birds of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.....	163
YODER, FRED R.: Social Adaptation and Lag of the Rural Church in Whitman County, Washington.....	123

Erratum: In Roland B. Botting's "Christopher Smart in London," page 37, line 9, read "RECEIVED" instead of "REECEIVED."

RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

PRICE LIST OF SEPARATE NUMBERS

Vol. I:

- No. 1, The Source of the Swank Placers, by John Prentiss Thomson; Permeability of the Intestinal Mucosa to Native Focal Bacteria, by LaVerne Almon Barnes; The Flowering and Fruiting Habits of *Lomatium*, by Edith Hardin; Plants of the Headwaters of the St. John River, Maine, by Harold St. John; New and Noteworthy Northwestern Plants, Part 2, by Harold St. John, 64 pp., 4 figs., 3 pl. Price\$.75
- No. 2, Validity Studies of Objective Tests, by Chff Winfield Stone; Teratologic Forms of *Trillium ovatum* and *Trillium petiolatum*, by Rebecca Catherine Palmer; *Eriogonum* composition and Its Variations, by Harold St. John & Fred A. Warren; New and Noteworthy Northwestern Plants, Part 3, by Harold St. John, 48 pp., 4 figs., 2 pl. Price\$.50
- No. 3, The Moss Flora of Southeastern Washington and Adjacent Idaho, Part 1, by George Neville Jones, 40 pp., map, Price\$.50
- No. 4, The Moss Flora of Southeastern Washington and Adjacent Idaho, Part 2, by George Neville Jones, 40 pp. Price\$.50

Vols. II-V (1930, 1935-37):

See pages 119-20 of Volume VII.

Vol. VI (1938):

- No. 1, Mechanisms of Freezing Resistance in the Needles of *Pinus ponderosa* and *Pseudotsuga mucronata*, by Harry F. Clements; Fielding's *Universal Gallant*, by Emmett L. Avery; An Ecological Study of Kamiak Butte, by Lowell A. Mullen, 48 pp., 11 plates. Price\$.50
- No. 2, The Problem of Parole, Part II, by Carl I. Erickson; The Inheritance of Reaction to Physiologic Races of *Tilletia tritici* (Bjerk.) Wint. in a Winter Wheat Cross, by Alva M. Schlehuber; Reaction of Winter Wheat to Physiologic Races of *Tilletia levis* Kühn and *T. tritici* (Bjerk.) Wint., by Alva M. Schlehuber; Oxidation-Reduction Potentials of Arsenate-Arsenite Systems in Sand and Soil Media, by Clark M. Keaton; The Interfacial Tensions of Some Mercury-Hydrocarbon Oils, by Fritz A. Hedman, 56 pp., 3 fig. Price\$.60
- No. 3, Delinquency Areas in Spokane, Washington, by H. Ashley Weeks and Margaret G. Smith; A Comparison of an English Test and a Psychological Examination at the College Level, by Newton Jesse Aiken; A Possible Source of Lessing's *Horoshop*, by Paul P. Kies, 24 pp., Price\$.35
- No. 4, Pioneer Social Adaptation in the Palouse Country of Eastern Washington, 1870-90, by Fred R. Yoder; The Number of Unincorporated Places in the United States and Their Estimated Populations, by Paul H. Landis, 60 pp., Price\$.70

Vol. VII (1939):

- No. 1, Christopher Smart in London, by Roland B. Botting; An Addition to the Canon of Stephen Crane, by Lyndon U. Pratt; The French Labor Movement 1880-95, by Harold E. Blinn, 72 pp. Price\$.75
- No. 2, Victorian Evaluation of *The Ring and the Book*, by B. R. McElderry, Jr.; *The Craftsman* of July 2, 1737, and Colley Cibber, by Emmett L. Avery; Armor and Weapons in the Middle English Romances, by Robert W. Ackerman, 48 pp. Price\$.50
- No. 3, Social Adaptation and Lag of the Rural Church in Whitman County, Washington, by Fred R. Yoder; The Preparation of Galacturonic and Mucic Acids from Pectic Substances, by Hugh H. Mottern; Viroses of the Garden Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) in Washington, by Folke Johnson; Studies on the Control of Blue-Mold Decay of Apples, by Richard Wellman; New or Otherwise Noteworthy Northwestern Plants—III, by Carl W. Shorsmith, 40 pp. Price\$.50
- No. 4, Birds of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, by Leonard Wing; Studies of the Relationships of Some Features of Wheat Glumes to Resistance to Shattering and of the Use of Glume Strength as a Tool in Selecting for High Resistance to Shattering, by Orville A. Vogel; The Stage Popularity of *The Rehearsal*, 1671-1777, by Emmett L. Avery, 48 pp. Price\$.50

L.A.R.I.N.C.

INDIAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
INSTITUTE LIBRARY,
NEW DELHI

[illegible]